NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DXCV.

JUNE, 1906.

AN APPEAL TO OUR MILLIONAIRES.

BY X.

THE American people, like most other peoples of which we have knowledge, may be roughly divided into three classes—those who have much more money than is good for them, those who have perhaps as much money as is good for them, and those who have much less money than would be good for them. The first class is numerically small; the second class is larger but still small; and the third class is vastly larger than both the others together. As each voter in this country at this time has exactly the same voice in the government as every other voter, the laws regulating the acquisition and descent of property must sooner or later conform to the views of the voters of the third class,—that is to say, the voters who actually earn the bread they eat by the labor of their own hands, and whose lives are passed in that unceasing circulation of sorrow, where hard, daily toil sometimes provides, and sometimes fails to provide, the necessities of life for the toiler and those dependent upon him.

As the object of this article is to endeavor to persuade the possessors of "surplus wealth" to assist those of us who desire, as they desire, a conservative administration of our common government to secure, if possible, a continuance of such administration, it may be useful to preface the consideration of the subject

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the opinion of one of the wisest and most conservative members of the illustrious company of great American statesmen. Daniel Webster, with unerring sagacity, foresaw the marvellous era of material prosperity which awaited this country, owing to the beneficent gifts of Providence to it, when we entered into effective possession of the illimitable resources of the entire continent, and, after forecasting such great wealth for us, he added:

"The freest government, if it could exist, would not be long acceptable if the tendency of the laws was to create a rapid accumulation of property in a few hands. In the nature of things, those who have not property and see their neighbors possessed of much more than they think them to need cannot be favorable to laws made for the protection of such property. When this class becomes numerous, it grows clamorous. It looks on property as its prey and plunder, and is naturally ready at all times for violence and revolution. It would seem, then, to be the part of political wisdom to found government on property, but to establish such distribution of property, by the laws which regulate its transmission and alienation, as to interest the great majority of society in the support of the government."

The exact condition mentioned by Mr. Webster is the condition which confronts the American people to-day—that of "a rapid *accumulation of property in a few hands*"; and it ought to be possible for us to agree to follow his advice, and at least to endeavor to establish such distribution of property, by the laws which regulate its transmission and alienation, as to interest the great majority of society in the support of the government. That, indeed, would seem to be, in view of the existing and ever-increasing hostility to "surplus wealth," the one question now of supreme importance for discussion and decision. By its side, all the other questions under public discussion are of little or no importance.

The working-man—who constitutes a great majority—really does not much care whether New Mexico and Arizona are linked together or not; nor whether the sugar and tobacco of the Philippines pay one rate of duty or another; nor whether the rates on railways shall be regulated by a commission or by the courts; nor whether hides shall come in free or pay a duty; nor whether some Jew bankers in Europe shall rob the poverty-stricken inhabitants of Santo Domingo; nor whether the canal at Panama shall be at sea-level or with locks; nor whether a few thousand more or less undesirable immigrants shall be excluded; nor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether a dozen more or less incompetent consuls shall be supplanted. All these are admirable subjects for academic discussion by the President and Congress, but they interest hardly anybody outside of Washington, unless his pecuniary interests may be affected by their decision; whereas, the working-man all over the land is every day being told that the great fortunes of our millionaires have been dishonestly accumulated and are for him a constant menace and oppression.

The evil effects of billions of money in a few hands upon the masses of the people, as foretold by Mr. Webster, are therefore gravely aggravated, it must always be remembered, by the general belief that "the rapid accumulation of property in a few hands" has been the result of immoral and illegal practices on the part of its possessors. They are assured, in season and out of season, that its possessors have organized trusts to crush competition; that they have corrupted traffic-managers of railways to secure rebates; and that they have corrupted Congressmen to secure tariff schedules for their advantage; while other millionaires are pointed out as having corrupted aldermen to give them for nothing franchises in the streets belonging to the people; and other equally abhorrent ways are stated as having been the means for the acquisition of these disproportionate fortunes. For the purpose of this argument, it may be taken for granted that these accusations are not all well founded; but they all have secured a lodgment in the minds of many good people, and whoever doubts this fact can readily satisfy himself of it by looking at random at half a dozen of our leading newspapers or half a dozen of our most widely circulated magazines, not to speak of many speeches in both Houses of Congress and some suggestive allusions to the subject by President Roosevelt. A writer of established reputation is just reported as declaring that many of our millionaires are corruptionists, contributors to campaign funds to buy betrayals of public trusts, and "worse than any pirate flying the black flag on the high seas."

Perhaps the most important fact about these accusations is that they have now permeated what, in the matter of wealth, may be called our middle class, composed of those who are not rich enough to be envied and yet who are not poor enough to be pitied. A significant illustration of the extension of this prejudice to this class is found in an illuminating cartoon recently published in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a certain weekly periodical whose circulation is limited, alike by its price and its contents, to well-to-do and cultivated people. In sarcastic allusion to the changes which have come over us since Washington was born, it gave a picture of a dinner in honor of his birthday, of which the unctuous host was labelled "Trust" and his dozen dropsical and unattractive guests were labelled with the actual names of our leading capitalists. Almost at the same time, twelve American citizens, presumably also of the middle class, and sworn jurors in a court of justice, declared by their verdict that the odious offence of kidnapping an innocent child was not to be regarded as a crime if the victim of it was the child of a millionaire; and, about the same time, a telegram appeared stating that a learned gentleman had addressed so conservative a body as a club composed of members of the Presbyterian Church upon the subject: "Why Great Fortunes in America Are a Positive Menace to the Public Welfare."

Innumerable other instances could be given, but surely these are sufficient, to show that the persons to whom this appeal is addressed ought, without delay, to take into thoughtful and careful consideration the question, whether it is not now to their own true interest to join such of their fellow citizens as are absolutely free from envy of their wealth, and absolutely devoid of unkind feelings towards them, in trying to discover whether there is any practical method of alleviating, and, if possible, removing, the rapidly growing dissatisfaction with their continued possession of the vast sums of money which they have either themselves abstracted from the common store of all the people or which they have inherited from ancestors who had so abstracted them. For all the property of a free nation belongs to its inhabitants, and whoever abstracts anything from it must, when challenged, prove his right to what he has taken.

Of course, our millionaires share with the rest of us a natural dislike for unsolicited advice, nor are they very likely to regard as of any great importance opinions of themselves, their doings and their duties, expressed by anybody who is not of their own class, and particularly by a person who is not a "captain" of some kind of honest or dishonest industry or of some kind of honest or dishonest finance, and who is therefore incapable of ever becoming one of their class; and suggestions to them, as to how best to treat any dangers which seem to be threatening our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political and social system from their great possessions, might well appear to them an impertinence when offered by an outsider studying such subjects in a detached and disinterested manner, "far from the madding crowd" where, while you wait, trusts are formed, railroads are bought and sold, and bonds and stocks of water are ladled out to a thirsty public.

And yet if such suggestions are absolutely free from any taint of selfishness and are the result of careful study of "the condition, not the theory," which is soon again to confront the country as it did in 1896, and possibly, indeed, with far greater chances of success; and if the conclusions forced upon such a student of the incongruous elements of our political, industrial and social life are honestly reached, without uncharitableness, they may well be worthy of thoughtful consideration. For, while our millionaires are a small fraction of our population, they constitute just now "the storm centre" of it, and for this simple reason,—that, whether truly or untruly, they are believed to have managed, in more or less forbidden ways, to withdraw from their fellow countrymen much more of the common property of the nation than is really good for them, or for their children, and these vast accumulations of money in a few hands are thought to be of very evil import for our country.

Now, if it is really true that the holding of such vast sums of wealth, without any generally recognized moral title to them, by a comparatively small number of persons is of evil omen for our political and social peace, nobody is so deeply interested in knowing the fact as our millionaires themselves, nor is there good reason for supposing that they would be less willing than any equal number of their countrymen to take whatever steps they were convinced were necessary on their part to advance the general welfare.

If it should clearly appear to them that, alike as good men and as good citizens, they ought to disencumber themselves of a goodly portion of the wealth they or their ancestors have accumulated, no doubt ought to be entertained that they would so disencumber themselves; nor can there be any doubt that with their great practical sagacity they would find the least objectionable and most effective method of doing so. They are, indeed, only the children of their epoch,—they are only what we and the times in which we live have assisted to make them. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sometimes wander so far astray as to come under the observation of those who have little in common with them, and such slight and casual contact often satisfies observers of honest minds that they compare very favorably, as true lovers of their kind and their country, with those of us whose lot is of plainer living; and it is with such favorable opinions of the class under consideration, though with no concealment of their grave responsibilities for the dangers which seem now to threaten them and us, that the subject will be pursued.

We must also always remember that we have treated our millionaires, young and old and of both sexes, most unfairly. For a long while we unduly flattered them, and now we have suddenly relapsed into bitter hostility to them. It is not long since the entire class were fully justified in the insolent cynicism which led them to believe themselves objects of general admiration, simply because they had "money to burn." Newspapers printed their photographs and chronicled their movements, treating them, and even their children, as semi-official or semi-royal personages. Elaborate descriptions were published of their gorgeous homes in town and country; their castles in Europe; the gowns and jewels of their wives and daughters, their yachts, their four-in-hands, their monster motor-cars; the wasteful extravagance of their entertainments; and even the fabulous prices they paid for music to entertain empty-headed guests. A periodical actually flourished, and to it they gave large sums of money, which was largely devoted to silly flattery or salacious gossip about them and their doings, including their real and supposed violations of the Seventh Commandment.

This admiration was freely extended even to those members of the class who expended their money in mere silly indulgence of themselves and their poorer satellites in luxury and public ostentation, while those of them who made contributions to libraries or universities, or any other public object, were praised as if they were giving at some real sacrifice to themselves and were benefactors of mankind.

It is quite true that ordinary wisdom ought to have warned our millionaires that this state of mind could not long continue, and that they should use their "surplus wealth" so as not to unnecessarily inflame the minds of their less fortunate fellow citizens.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One does not wave a red flag in the face of a bull unless he has good reasons for wishing to inflame the bull; but, unfortunately, our millionaires, and especially their idle and degenerate children, have been flaunting their money in the faces of the poor as if actually wishing to provoke them to that insensate rage which is akin to madness, and leads "to murder and the breaking up of laws." In the sweep of a great current, it is foolish to exaggerate the influence of a small rivulet which joins it, but let us consider for a moment one matter of very minor importance, except as showing an apparent actual desire on the part of the rich to draw upon themselves the hatred of the poor. The motor-engine is not only a most valuable invention for many purposes, but it offers those rich enough to afford it a very attractive mode of travel, and has undoubtedly not only come to stay, but to increase rapidly in use, as it ought. When cars are of a size proportioned to the width of the highway on which they run and are propelled at moderate speed, they are used without serious danger or discomfort to any other person using the highway or living beside it. Nobody has ever been hurt or seriously annoyed by an automobile of proportionate size going at ten miles an hour. But the rich prefer to buy immense cars which take almost all of a narrow street or road, and to drive them on all streets and roads, narrow or wide, at such speed as imperils the lives and limbs of everybody in their path; and merely for their own selfish pleasure they afflict the poor and their children, well or ill, in their wayside homes, with offensive noise and clatter and more offensive odor, and cover them with thick layers of dust, as they do all the travellers they pass; and they actually kill other people on the highway if they are not able to run fast enough to escape them,—and then the great car speeds away. "The Sun" of New York reported the other day the killing of two aged women and one child; on another day two children were killed; on another day one child was killed and a laboring man with his dinner-pail on his arm. The newspapers this morning report the running down of two working-men on their way to work and a Catholic priest on his way to church. Since New-Year's Day these great cars, simply for the pleasure of their occupants, have killed more people on the public highways than were killed in the war with Spain.

Of course, there is nothing novel in this form of showing con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempt by the rich for the rights of the poor on the public highways. Here is a sketch, by a master hand, of a parallel scene in Paris, just before France was drenched in the blood of her "wealthy classes":

"With a wild rattle and clatter the carriage dashed through the streets and swept round corners with women screaming before it, and men clutching each other and clutching children out of its way. At last, swooping by a street corner, at a fountain, one of its wheels came to a sickening little jolt, and there was a loud cry and the horses reared and plunged. But for this the carriage probably would not have stopped, for carriages often drove on and left their wounded or killed behind them. 'What has gone wrong?' asked the Marquis, calmly looking out. 'A child has been killed,' was the answer, and he replied: 'It is extraordinary to me that you people cannot take care of yourselves and your children. One or the other of you is forever in the way!' and then the Marquis drove on to his grand château. But in the morning he was dead with the knife of the dead child's father in his heart."

Changing "carriage" to "motor-car," how much all this reads like an incident of to-day,—except that here, fortunately, we are in no danger of the taking of life for life.

While, therefore, our millionaires and their children may be justly blamed for their part in causing this change in the public attitude towards them, causing them to be objects of ever-increasing hatred to great numbers of the people, we must also take upon ourselves a very considerable portion of the blame for it. It was our plain duty to have warned them, and especially the young degenerates of the class, that the newly rich have in all ages, by their vulgar ostentation of their wealth, made themselves not only the shining mark of the satirist, but also sooner or later objects of general dislike. We should have told them that the sudden possession of unearned millions of money had always exercised a most disastrous effect upon weak minds. It had done so in Athens and in Rome, and it was certain to have the same disastrous effect upon weak minds here.

We did nothing of the kind, however, but sat idly by, apparently expecting that they would possess American common sense and be restrained by it from such follies in this country and at this age of the world.

The most important fact, indeed, about the possession of private property to-day, is that the world has moved "out of night into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

light," away from the days of despotism and privilege, and that it is now securely anchored in the democratic ages. Let us seriously consider what this means; and, above all, do not let any of our millionaires suppose that he can escape from the democratic ages by migrating to any other civilized country. The sudden appearance of over fifty Labor members in the British House of Commons clearly shows that the men who labor with their hands will at no distant day be in practical possession of the government of that country, while the rapid growth of Socialism in Germany indicates the approach of the same great change there, and it has already arrived in all the Latin countries.

Now, what are the bulwarks of private property in the imperial commonwealth of New York, where so much of it is situated? As to incomes, nobody will have the effrontery to deny that, if the majority of the voters choose to elect a Governor of their own way of thinking and a majority in both houses of the Legislature, they can readily enact a progressive taxation of incomes which will limit every citizen of New York State to such income as the majority of the voters consider sufficient for him.

It is, if possible, even less likely that anybody will deny that, in order to effectually turn every dollar of the property of every decedent into the public treasury at his death, no affirmative legislation is necessary. It is only necessary to repeal the statutes now authorizing the descent of such property to the heirs and legatees of the decedent. It is perfectly apparent, therefore, that there is no ultimate security for a single dollar of private property in New York, and precisely the same statement is true of all other American States, except such as a majority of the voters may decide to be just and wise, both to the possessors of such property and to the community at large. Nor, for reasons which there is not room now to detail, can any substantial protection be obtained from the National Government. Even if any constitutional provision stood in the way, it could be removed by the same majority of voters whenever they chose to do so.

If an agitation was started for such legislation, there would be at least a serious probability that it would succeed, for the dissatisfaction with great fortunes seems to be rapidly increasing, both in extent and in intensity. To prove this it is unnecessary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have recourse to what might be regarded as the wild and reckless statements of sensational newspapers or sensational agitators. Such statements ought not, however, to be wholly disregarded, for they now reach vast numbers of working-men, upon whose ballots we must all ultimately depend for the safety of whatever amount of property we possess.

Here is a typical quotation from a widely circulated newspaper:

> "The persons who are disliked and now even scorned openly are those who have secured by crooked means what in fact belongs to other people. Slowly but surely, in obedience to the immovable instinct of justice, the American people, always wise and reasonable, have concluded that these men have grown rich by manipulation and sharp practices, and are simply thieves. Thieves they are, if they have not given services for their dollars,—if their wealth represents simply a dextrous shuffling of the cards,—and to be a pariah in the secret or openly expressed opinion of millions of one's fellow countrymen is a doom hardly less dreadful than an ignominious death."

These may be dismissed as "wild and whirling words," but they are the counterpart of hundreds of such utterances reaching millions of American voters, and it is sheer folly to close our eyes longer to that grave and momentous fact. So far from frankness being at all incompatible with kindness, it is often the best possible expression of it; and it certainly is so in treating of the very unfortunate situation now occupied by those of our fellow citizens who possess great fortunes. They have come to be regarded, no doubt often most unjustly, as "enemies of the republic,"—men engaged in corrupting our politics, degrading our business, and for their own profits forming illegal trusts and combinations, and thereby robbing the poorer classes of their countrymen of part of the meagre pittance they receive for their hard and irksome toil. Their "surplus wealth," which only a year ago was not only gladly accepted but eagerly solicited, is now in many respectable quarters flouted as "tainted money," that is, money dishonestly obtained, and which no institution or person can accept without sharing in the wrongs by which it was obtained. The common mind seems suddenly to have jumped, so to speak, to the conclusion that these billions of money could not have been honestly earned, and therefore that they have been dishonestly abstracted, in one improper way or another, from the poor. Happily, under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our system of government, even if all this were true, there is not the slightest pretence for resorting to violent methods, because, as has already been shown, lawful methods are ample and can readily and quickly reach any result which the majority of the voters think desirable.

Nor must we be led away by our prejudices as possessors of property, great or small, to consider as novel, and therefore as alarming, the idea of submitting to the majority of the voters the decision as to what laws shall regulate the acquisition and disposal of private property; for, if there was an authority to which a conservative inquirer upon the subject could safely appeal in this matter, it certainly would be to that of a Chief Justice of England, yet here is what Lord Coleridge said:

"In the present day, there is nothing perhaps as to which confusion of thought is greater and more mischievous than as to property itself —the idea, the principle of property, and as to the laws of property, the rules by which the practical enjoyment of property is to be regulated. Now, what is the right of property? The end of property is subsistence, by which end nature has bounded our pretensions to it; hence, in a state of nature, we cannot take more than we use nor hold it longer than we live and are capable of using it. The manner of acquiring property in a state of nature is by occupancy—all other modes of transmitting or acquiring property are acts of positive and civil law, which laws prevent the property of the dead from reverting, as it otherwise would do in a state of nature, to the common stock.

"All the complicated and conflicting systems by which in various civilized countries the powers of the possessors of property, even in various ways, are now narrowed and now enlarged, are systems of positive law, and the right of property has never existed, even in its most absolute form, without some restriction. The right of inheritance, a purely artificial right, has been at different times and in different countries very variously dealt with.

"The same power which prescribes rules for the possession and descent of property can of course alter them, for plain absurdities would follow if this were not so; and the consent of nations and the practice of ages have long since established this simple truth. It has been shown from reason and upon authority that the great and beneficent institution of private property rests only upon the general advantage. The particular rules by which the enjoyment of property is regulated differ in every country in the world and must rest at last upon one and the same foundation, the general advantage; and the defence of any such law of property must ultimately rest on this, that it inures to the general advantage; and in free countries, indeed, I cannot conceive any law standing on any other basis. The object of the restrictions placed in England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for many centuries upon powers of settlement and devise is invariably stated to have been to prevent mischievous accumulations of property in a few hands. It seems, indeed, an elementary proposition that a free people can deal as it thinks fit with its common stock of property, and can prescribe to its citizens such rules as it sees fit for its enjoyment, alienation and transmission.

"A very large coal-owner, some years ago, interfered, with a high hand, in one of the coal strikes. He sent for the workmen. He declined to argue, but he said, stamping his foot upon the ground, 'All the coal within so many square miles is mine, and if you do not instantly come to terms not a hundredweight of it shall be brought to the surface and it shall remain unworked.' This utterance of his was much discussed at the time. By some it was held up as a subject of panegyric and a model for imitation; the manly utterance of one who would stand no nonsense and who was determined to assert his rights of property and to tolerate no interference with them. By others he was denounced as insolent and brutal, and it was suggested that, if a few more men said such things and a few men acted on them, it would very probably result in the coal-owners having not much right of property left to be interfered with. I should myself deny that the mineral treasures placed by Providence under the soil of a country belong to a handful of surface proprietors in the sense in which this gentleman appeared to think that they did. That a few persons would have a right to agree to shut the coal-mines of Great Britain seems to me, I must frankly say, unspeakably absurd.

"The general advantage was in former days absolutely and avowedly regarded, and when rights of private property interfered with them such rights were summarily set aside; and, while property itself was acknowledged, the laws of its enjoyment were regulated according to what was thought to be the general advantage. All laws of property must stand upon the foot of the general advantage, for a country belongs to its inhabitants; and in what proportions and by what rules its inhabitants are to own its property must be settled by the law; and the moment a fragment of the people set up rights as inherent in them and not founded upon the public good, plain absurdities follow, for laws of property are like all other laws, to be changed when the public good requires it. It would be well, indeed, that the owners of property in land or money, from the largest to the smallest, should recognize that their title to the enjoyment of it must rest upon the same foundation, and that the mode and measure of their enjoyment of the common stock of the state, if it injures the state, can no more be defended and will no more be endured by a free people than any other public mischief or nuisance."

We have now heard from two great conservative authorities on the subject of private property, Daniel Webster speaking to an assemblage of conservative New England citizens met to celebrate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the two-hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, and Chief-Justice Coleridge addressing an assemblage of conservative lawyers in conservative Scotland.

The Chief Justice tells us that the laws of property "must stand upon the foot of the general advantage," because a country belongs to its inhabitants; and in what proportions and by what rules its inhabitants are to own its property must be settled by the law,—that is, under the free government we enjoy, by a majority of the voters. Mr. Webster tells us that, when we approach the majority of the voters on this subject, we will find that, "in the nature of things, those who have not property and see their neighbors possessed of much more than they think them to need cannot be favorable to laws made for the protection of such property," and he therefore advises us to establish such distribution of property, by the laws which regulate its transmission and alienation, as to interest the great majority of society in the support of the government. The problem before us seems, therefore, to resolve itself into this: Given the existing dissatisfaction of what is presumably a majority of the voters with the vast fortunes which have recently been accumulated, what is the best method of assuaging that discontent and of placing the laws for the enjoyment and inheritance of property upon such reasonable bases as will commend themselves to the majority of the American electorate?

The thing most to be desired in political evolution is that any radical changes which are to be introduced under the forms of law should be introduced gradually, instead of being the result of any sudden access of popular wrath. All students of comparative politics will agree that such sudden access of popular wrath is always to be apprehended in a "top-heavy" society,—that is, a society where a small proportion of the population have, by fair means or foul, appropriated to themselves an undue proportion of the material luxury and prosperity of their epoch, leaving the great toiling masses to become thoroughly permeated with the conviction, not only that they are unjustly treated, but that it has become their sacred duty to terminate such injustice by what Mr. Webster calls "violence and revolution." The suddenness of such revolutions, and their unexpectedness by the victims of them, is one of the commonplaces of history. The small minority at the top, accustomed to enjoy themselves as they please and to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regard those beneath them as permanent mudsills doomed by Providence to work and suffer, in order that they themselves may be idle and luxurious, never seem to have sufficient intelligence to realize the dangers which threaten their privileges and themselves, even when such dangers are close at hand and ought to have been clearly perceived. This was notably the case just before the French Revolution, when not only Arthur Young, whose sympathies were rather with the oppressed and tortured peasantry than with their oppressors, but even Lord Chesterfield, whose sympathies were naturally with the governing class to which he belonged, coming from another country, were able to see the perilous condition in which the royalty and aristocracy of France were then standing, and they substantially agreed that the signs of a great revolution were then to be seen by anybody who had eyes to see them.

As we know, the wealthy classes of France believed themselves to be entirely secure in the possession of all their properties and privileges and could not see their danger. This same story has just been repeated in the Russian Revolution. The Russian autocracy a year ago believed themselves to be in secure possession of all their properties and privileges, and they fully expected that the Russian workmen and peasants would continue contentedly to labor for future generations, in order that they should continue to enjoy themselves as they pleased; and yet we have all seen to what a sudden and terrible awakening their blindness subjected them. Many unkind observers insist that our millionaires have been stricken with just such blindness; but it must be remembered that, this being actually a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," ballots will here prove far more effective in reaching any result the majority of the voters may desire as to the possession and distribution of property, than could possibly be secured by any number of dynamite bombs; so that the danger confronting us is that the majority of American voters will effect their wishes by very extreme and and very dangerous legislation, unless they are guided in safer paths.

As this article is being written the American Federation of Labor announces that it is about to enter politics, showing that here, as in most other countries, the laboring classes are taking their place in practical politics with leaders who believe in their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause and who have a devoted and enthusiastic following. Such being the case, it is apparent that the important middle class of the American people, who possess only a moderate amount of property, will find it quite impossible to stem the advancing tide demanding a radical readjustment of the distribution of property, unless our millionaires promptly and efficiently come to their assistance. It has, indeed, become the duty of every true lover of his country, to whatever class he belongs, to look the existing situation of American politics frankly and courageously in the face, and to be prepared to make whatever sacrifices are needful to find, if possible, some common basis of a sane agreement upon the subject. Such an agreement must offer every proper inducement to the capacity and the energy of every American citizen, to exert himself and all his abilities to the utmost degree consistent with the general welfare; and he should be encouraged to believe that the acquisition and descent of such reasonable accumulations of private property as his energies and ability can honestly secure will remain perfectly safe, under the protecting ægis of the law.

These considerations naturally bring us to the *crux* of the situation, which is, as has been stated, the popular estimation of the absence of any moral title of our millionaires to the billions of money they have either themselves succeeded in abstracting from the common store or have inherited from ancestors who had so abstracted it. It must always be remembered that it is naturally very difficult for the owners of "surplus wealth" to recognize that any ethical basis whatever for their alleged ownership of their property can be necessary. To their minds, it represents what they call "vested interests," and the world has so long lived and prospered upon this theory that it seems equally startling and inadmissible to demand now that a man possessing millions of money should be called upon to show that his ownership of them is rightful, not only in his own view, but in the view of the majority of his fellow men. In all the past ages, such basis was so far from being demanded that the exact contrary gave a perfectly defensible title. A king's mistress could not only confer such a title to a vast extent of lands, but she could also introduce her complaisant family into the inner circles of the land's nobility. A king's friendship was a satisfactory basis, as is easily shown in many cases, by tracing titles to land and rank back to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their sources. A courtier's subservience in evil ways to the court was such a basis. A soldier's courage on the field of battle gave a far better title, though still a title based upon the will of a master and not upon the consent of the people. Those were the days when each man was avowedly for himself, seizing all he could extort from others, and the devil was solicited to take the hindmost.

But we have now changed all that, and no title to property or privilege of any kind can to-day have any other sufficient basis than that named by Lord Coleridge—that such title is "consonant with the general advantage,"—all other sources of title to property and privilege having disappeared before the growth of the modern idea of equality of rights, as the mists of the morning before the sun. The virile, growing, controlling nations of the earth have all practically accepted manhood suffrage, and on that basis their governments rest. Each man, by reason of his manhood alone and without the slightest reference to the amount of property he possesses, has an equal voice with every other man in making the laws governing their common country and regulating the distribution of the common property. Such a consummation was devoutly to be wished; but all desirable situations of every kind are liable to present some undesirable aspects, and one of the undesirable aspects of a situation conferring absolute equality of political rights upon every man in the community is the danger that it will be supposed by thoughtless and ill-regulated minds that equality of political rights necessarily involves equality in the possession of property. This is the underlying and attractive idea of Socialism, but such an assumption, as is well known, violates one of the primal facts in the history of man—the immense and incalculable differences which exist in men's natural capacities for rendering honest service to society. Encouragement should be given, in the interest of society itself, to every man to use all the gifts he possesses to the fullest extent possible, in every channel of usefulness, so far as such use is compatible with the welfare of the majority of his fellow men. To each of us is now being repeated the fateful question which Cain asked: "Am I my brother's keeper?" and each of us must answer: "Yes, I am my brother's keeper, to the extent that I am not at liberty to take a dollar unjustly from him, nor to accumulate a dollar of property for myself ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cept with full, careful and generous consideration of what is due to him."

Such an admission as this by our millionaires, and consistent action upon it, would do much, even at this late day, to assist in preventing the success of wild schemes of confiscation, although unhappily the protection of private property in America no longer rests upon voters born here and bred in our atmosphere of conservatism, where respect for private property was a part of the breath of their lives. Our millionaires are accused, among other things, of not being contented with the great gains they were making from their railways, their mines and their manufactories when relying upon the labor of American voters, and of degrading our suffrage yearly by deluging us with hundreds of thousands of laborers, whom they persuade to come here from the least desirable classes of Europe, and who, only too soon after their arrival, secure for themselves the right of suffrage, thus distinctly lowering the political intelligence and the political sobriety of our electorate and distinctly and swiftly impairing the security of all private possessions.

They are also accused of dealing another blow at the security of private property. Such security must finally rest upon respect for law, and such respect, if it had not been impaired, would have furnished a very valuable bulwark against every form of Socialism and civil anarchy, however disguised. It is said that our millionaires have initiated and for many years maintained a regular and growing system of political corruption, taking no other interest in our politics than that of drawing checks for the avowed purpose of debasing and degrading the voters, and teaching them that their votes ought to bring them plunder in some form or other. No worse training in evil could possibly have been devised; but it is very unfair to blame our millionaires too severely for this unwise and wicked use of their "surplus wealth," as we all encouraged such contributions, even from the sacred funds of life-insurance companies. Such contributions are now claimed to have hypnotized Presidents and Cabinet members and Congressmen, thereby securing protection for illegal trusts and monopolies and maintaining such a tariff as enables our millionaires to raise the prices of the articles they sell as high as they choose, while they also obtain absolute free trade in labor, so that they can always flood the labor market, as they have done in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the anthracite-coal regions, with a supply far beyond any reasonable demand and thus keep the wages of labor as low as they choose.

Now, as long as no complaints were heard, and the laboring people had no leaders and above all no literature, questioning the wisdom and the justice of allowing great fortunes to be thus acquired, it was possible to go on living as we have been doing, repeating to each other that everything was for the best in this best of all possible worlds, and that there was no need for any change whatever; but, as we have seen, this halcyon situation has suddenly changed and this serene sky is filled with threatening clouds.

It is certainly timely, therefore, to consider whether we cannot find some basis for private property, which ought, and might even yet, receive the approval of a majority of the American electorate. Suppose we should try the harmless experiment of applying some practical ethical test whereby the rightfulness of each man's possessions could be somewhat fairly, even if roughly, judged on moral grounds or grounds of "the general advantage." If honestly desiring such a test, we would probably find it in a fair and reasonable equivalent of service to the people for the money withdrawn from the people; and for the purpose of suggestion only an illustration of this ethical proposition might be found in the amount of the salary of the President of the United States. He is supposed to be a person of the very first order, alike in character and in capacity, and equal in both respects to the ablest of our millionaires; and he is charged with as grave, multiform and onerous duties as can fall to the lot of any living man. Now, for a man of that high order and for his exclusive devotion to such engrossing and far-reaching duties as the office entails the American people, by their chosen representatives, have adjudged fifty thousand dollars a year, and the defraying of certain expenses incident to the office, to be a fair and reasonable compensation for his best service. In other words, such a man and such services would be treated in an algebraic formula as equal to fifty thousand dollars a year and the outlays already mentioned; and the American people have decided that, in Lord Coleridge's words, it is for "the general advantage" that such should be the compensation of the President of the United States. Why should any other citizen either wish or be permitted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

withdraw from the common store a larger annual sum? A man gifted with exceptional ability, who has devoted many years of his life to perfecting a most useful invention, comes to the American people and says: "I have discovered something which will be greatly to your advantage. What compensation ought I fairly to receive for it?" And the chosen representatives of the people, speaking for them, answer: "It is for 'the general advantage' to encourage useful inventions, and therefore if we find your invention useful we will give you the exclusive right to the profits of it for fourteen years, at the end of which time it shall become public property." A person with very unusual ability for initiating and managing a great industrial enterprise, or a great banking house, or a great system of transportation, or a great department store, comes to the American people and says: "I wish to devote myself to your service. What will you allow me to withdraw from the common property for such service?" For the sake of argument only, suppose the American people in their generosity answer each of these able men: "Well, we will give you as much as we give the President of the United States; and, while we only give him that compensation at most for eight years, we will give it to you for all the active years of your life, so that if you live fairly long and are a good husbandman of your means you ought to be able, besides living luxuriously, to leave a million dollars at your death."

If a manager of an industrial enterprise should say: "But I have other abilities besides those you have considered—I have ability to corrupt the traffic-managers of great railways and thus secure rebates for my enterprise," the answer would have to be that securing rebates is a public wrong. If a banker said: "I have a great talent for combining different corporations into one mass, thus creating a monopoly for the new enterprise and trebling its capitalization," the answer would have to be that monopolies have always been odious even at the common law and are expressly forbidden by our statute law. If the proprietor of a department store should say: "My ability will enable me to drive thousands of independent shopkeepers and tradesmen out of business and compel them to enter the ranks of those who work for wages," the answer must be that such conduct, so far from being a public advantage, is a public disadvantage; and so throughout the long list of able, agile and more or less unscrupulous captains

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of one kind of industry or another, or one kind of finance or another, who offer their services to the American people. They ought to be fully compensated for everything they do which is, in the words of Lord Coleridge, "for the general advantage," and it is undoubtedly for the general advantage that their unusual abilities should be utilized, just so far as the utilization of them is compatible with the general welfare; but the use of their abilities ought to be sternly and rigorously prohibited whenever they exercise them to the general disadvantage and abstract money not morally due from the people to put into their own pockets.

A man presents himself and says: "I have discovered a place down in the earth where Providence has made a deposit of coal or iron or precious metals—what will you give me for my services in superintending the bringing of them to market?" Another man presents himself and says: "I have traversed a region which Providence has blessed with a fertile soil and other sources of traffic for a railway—what will you give me for persuading capital to enable me to build the railway and for managing it after it is built?" As neither has anything to offer but his services, might not the annual compensation of the President of the United States be a generous annual compensation for each of them? And if that would be a generous compensation, certainly neither of them can possess any moral title to more.

It is difficult to see how any real injustice would be done to any honest member of society, or how undue restraint would be put upon any ability or energy of a beneficent character, if the law encouraged every man to earn for himself, say, a yearly income of fifty thousand dollars and to acquire a solid fortune of a million dollars. Such sums would allow not only an ample but a very generous provision for everybody dependent upon him while he lived and after he was dead; and it is difficult to realize what more the heart of any man could desire, who recognizes that he is a part of a Christian society and not a pirate on the Barbary coast.

If that view should be ever accepted, there will be no practical difficulty in framing laws, either State or Federal, which would impose such a scale of progressive taxation on both incomes and inheritances as would discourage the appropriation by any man, by one evil device or another, of unearned millions of money from the common property of the community; and, so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far from such laws operating unkindly or harshly upon our millionaires themselves, they might be found to confer upon them the greatest possible benefit, and to give them such peace and happiness as they can never enjoy while holding fast to fortunes which the majority of their fellow men have come to believe to be "tainted money."

A great deal of utter nonsense has been talked about the necessity of allowing predatory persons of a burglarious disposition to take from society whatever sums they can, "by hook or by crook," secure, as otherwise it is said their astounding abilities would not be put to use. It is a strange and indeed a degrading delusion to suppose that, judged by any moral standard, either the desire or the capacity to amass a large fortune can be anything but a public calamity. On all ethical subjects the great poets are singularly gifted in seeing the truth and singularly brave in speaking it. Virgil wrathfully exclaims:

> "Accursed thirst for wealth, to what do you not drive the minds of men!"

and centuries later Tennyson wrathfully exclaims:

> "Pickpockets, each hand lusting for all that is not its own,
> And lust of gain in the spirit of Cain!"

The truth is that no genuine service in any department of human effort has ever been conferred upon mankind merely for the sake of money, nor is any person who is desirous of having "money to burn" capable of rendering any really valuable service. The two qualities of mind always have been and always will be incompatible. The good work of the world has never been done from such an incentive. The good men of the world have never done any work from such an incentive. Excessive gains, like excessive salaries, are inherently dishonest, and the men who seek them cannot possibly be of any genuine value to the American people. The less temptation, therefore, we offer men to work merely to amass great fortunes the better for them and for us, and the more sternly we confine everybody to honest returns for honest service the better for them and for us. Whoever has a dollar for which a dollar's worth, in property or service, has not been given, has a dishonest dollar, and if he keeps it, he is a dishonest man, no matter by what fine phrases he seeks to cover such dishonesty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And a dishonest man can confer no real benefit upon an honest community.

The time, indeed, is perhaps not distant when everybody possessing private property will be required to answer these two plain questions: "How much have you withdrawn from the common store?" and "What service did you give in return for it?" An honest man who has given an honest equivalent for the money he has received can readily answer both these questions, and in all the diversified ranks of American energy and industry there are great multitudes of men who can promptly and satisfactorily show a dollar's worth of honest service for every dollar they have received; and doubtless some of the possessors of great fortunes can render such an accounting for a part of the "surplus wealth" they possess; but to do so they must rigidly eliminate all illegal, corrupt, immoral or demoralizing activities in which they have engaged. If the elimination of all accretions to their fortunes by such means reduces their millions to reasonable limits, they ought in justice to themselves to make the necessary sacrifice involved in such reduction. If they would do so, there is no doubt they would be met in a corresponding spirit by all classes of their fellow citizens, and an enduring basis would be secured for the honest exercise of individualism in all departments of activity, and for the placing of all the rewards thus earned upon a basis of enduring security.

If, however, our millionaires prefer to remain as they have hitherto chosen to remain, outside the current of the national life, leaving its politics to take care of themselves except when they draw checks, and cherishing the fond delusion which the possessors of unearned wealth have so often cherished, that the growing dissatisfaction with them and their possessions, and the methods by which they were acquired, is merely a temporary excitement and in their favorite phrase "will soon blow over,"—then it may be stated, with entire confidence and without the slightest exaggeration, that they are destined to a very early and unwelcome awakening, when they will find themselves confronted with the transfer of the government with all its great powers for good and for evil into the hands of men of a very limited conception of "vested interests," and whose minds will be inflamed with a wrath which they will consider righteous and a hostility which may prove to be implacable. Unless, therefore,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some moral basis for what the majority of voters believe to be the present grossly unjust inequality in the distribution of property in this country is soon found,—a moral basis which will prove acceptable to the majority of American voters,—we may encounter in the coming Presidential election a situation infinitely more disturbing and infinitely more dangerous than has ever before been encountered. It seems the dictate alike of interest and of patriotism for each of us, whatever his class, to do all in his power to prevent such a calamity; and, even should our united efforts ultimately fail to check the advancing tide of Socialism and to place the right of individual citizens to acquire and retain all property honestly earned by them upon an impregnable legal basis, it would surely always be a consoling reflection to have borne a part in so good a fight for so good a purpose. Such an opportunity if now rejected may never return for:

> "The moving finger writes, and having writ
> Moves on."

X.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GRADUATED TAXATION OF INCOMES AND INHERITANCES.

BY WAYNE MAC VEAGH.

It ought to be confessed, on the threshold of the discussion of this subject, that it is somewhat disconcerting for one who has for some years been proposing, with very indifferent success, a particular extension of the principles of taxation, to find that such extension has attained a sudden and wholly unexpected importance, having become in a single day a question justifying immediate and earnest consideration.

For, whatever opinion may be entertained of the propriety or wisdom of President Roosevelt's recent expression in favor of graduated taxation, no sensible person can doubt that what he said to the Senators and Representatives assembled before him on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the new Congressional building at Washington at once removed the question of such taxation from the realm of academic discussion, and brought it into the domain of practical politics and legislative enactment. It is, therefore, a dictate of "saving common sense," for all who sincerely desire that such taxation should be kept within safe and conservative bounds, to look the question thus suddenly presented by the President calmly and quietly in the face, to confront without alarm any dangers it may be supposed to bring in its train and to thresh thoroughly out the problems the proposition suggests.

Such problems must finally be passed upon by the public opinion of the country; and it is indispensable that such opinion should be enlightened by a full and free discussion before it is called upon for a decision. It can be readily shown, if a proper effort is made to do so, that it is for the general public welfare, for the true welfare of every class in the community, that any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scheme of graduated taxation should be framed upon such a moderate basis as will leave room for the freest possible play and the fullest possible exercise of the energy, industry and ability of every American citizen, by offering, to his praiseworthy ambition to acquire property, all such rewards in money as are compatible with even-handed justice to his fellows. He must not only be permitted, but encouraged, to labor for his own advantage, so long as his advantage is consistent with the advantage of the community, as honest thrift always is.

It was, however, astonishing to observe that President Roosevelt's mild words caused something resembling consternation, even in intelligent quarters. This attitude towards his suggestion is the more surprising because the writer of this article succeeded eight years ago in persuading the late Senator Wolcott of Colorado that graduated taxation was a beneficent form of imposing taxes, and in inducing him to propose such taxation of inheritances as part of the War Revenue Act then pending in Congress. It was presented by him, accepted by both Houses, and approved by President McKinley on June 13th, 1898.

As it was a tentative measure, its terms were purposely made very moderate; but it distinctly affirmed the principle of graduated taxation by steadily increasing the rate to be levied as the amount of the inheritance increased. It was modelled in this respect upon the Act by which the Parliament of Great Britain had, four years before, imposed a graduated tax, but at a heavier rate, upon inheritances. This law remained in force for four years, and was only repealed with the other war taxes.

It is hardly necessary to say that it had in the mean time been vigorously assailed as unconstitutional. Capitalists exhibit a singular stupidity in resisting every attempt to impose upon them their proper share of the public burdens; and, as they had succeeded in annulling the law imposing a very modest proportional tax upon their incomes, they assumed they would easily annul a law imposing a graduated tax upon their inheritances. Twenty leading members of the bar appeared in the attack upon the law and only one in defence of it—the then Solicitor-General. The result was that the constitutionality of such method of taxation by Congress was conclusively established in a masterly opinion by Mr. Justice White, in the course of which he used this suggestive language:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The review which we have made exhibits the fact that taxes imposed with reference to the ability of the person on whom the burden is placed to bear the same have been levied since the foundation of the Government. So, also, some authoritative thinkers and a number of economic writers contend that a progressive tax is more just and equal than a proportional one. In the absence of constitutional limitation, the question whether it is or is not is legislative and not judicial. The grave consequences which, it is asserted, must arise in the future, if the right to lay a progressive tax be recognized, involves in its ultimate aspect the mere assertion that free and representative government is a failure."

This weighty utterance is not only illuminating, as disposing of all question as to the right of Congress to impose a system of graduated taxation, but its concluding words make a serious appeal to all American citizens who, so far from believing that free and representative government is a failure, believe, with a faith which can never be shaken, that it is, with all its drawbacks, the best form of government ever vouchsafed to the children of men. They fully recognize that eternal vigilance is the price which must be paid for its blessings,—that all good citizens must become "practical politicians," sometimes turning their backs upon what Lord Bacon calls "the idols of the market-place," and turning their faces towards political meetings and the polling-booths. They must labor to make the public service a service pure and undefiled, worthy of the best efforts of the best men. When this is done, our form of government will abundantly justify itself. If the rich will honestly attend to their political duties, all will go well.

The question now under consideration ought to be, indeed must be, if private property is to be safe, discussed fully and thoroughly, and all classes of voters must be shown what are the proper bases of the graduated taxation of "surplus wealth," whether as income or as inheritance. There is no use in pretending that the proposal to establish such a system of taxation is of a radical, much less of a revolutionary, character, or in attempting to persuade the American electorate that it is a wicked attack upon private property to ask Congress to adopt a system of taxation which has been accepted by the most aristocratic and conservative legislative assemblage in the world—the House of Lords of Great Britain. After twelve years' experience of it, the graduated taxation of inheritances is now firmly established

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as part of the permanent financial policy of the United Kingdom.

It is also an interesting coincidence that, while President Roosevelt limited himself, at least for the present, to the graduated taxation of inheritances, Mr. Asquith, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, within a fortnight afterwards was telling the House of Commons that "the time has arrived for an inquiry into the practicability of a graduated tax upon incomes." Surely, if the time has arrived for the legislature of Great Britain, composed of King, Lords and Commons, to take the subject into consideration, it cannot be too early for our own Congress to do so; and it must be expected that, at its next session, bills will probably be introduced imposing graduated taxes upon both incomes and inheritances, notwithstanding the decision by a divided court against the recent proportional income tax. It is, indeed, believed by many persons that, when the question is again presented, an income tax will be upheld. If so, no time ought to be lost in endeavoring to impress upon the public mind the necessity of proper limits upon such taxation.

But it will be utterly useless in any such discussion to pretend that there is anything new or startling in proposing, in the apt words of Mr. Justice White, to impose taxes "with reference to the ability of the person upon whom the burden is placed to bear the same,"—that is, increasing the rate of taxation to keep pace with the wealth of the persons taxed. Indeed, it is a hundred and thirty years since Adam Smith announced that "the subjects of every State ought to contribute towards the support of its government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities"; and John Stuart Mill, at a later day, declared with even greater emphasis: "Equality of taxation, as a maxim of politics, means equality of sacrifice. It means the apportioning the contribution of each person towards the expenses of the government, so that he shall feel neither more nor less inconvenience from his share of the payment than every other person experiences from his." Professor Nicholson adds: "It is admitted that this standard cannot be completely realized; but it is thought to furnish a proper foundation for remission in some cases and for proportional increase of taxation in others." Complete realization in political economy of any standard of abstract justice is still far to seek; but there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be a reasonable and just basis for at least an approach to equality of sacrifice in the imposition of the taxes in question.

The sociological question ought also to be freely discussed,—that is: Ought there to be a limit fixed beyond which, for the public welfare, the further accumulation of surplus wealth should be discouraged? If so, where should the limit be placed and the discouragement begin, and at what ratio should the discouragement proceed? And if there is to be such discouragement, is a system of graduated taxation the most effective and least objectionable method of applying it? The suggestions formerly made in reference to such a system were concerned with apportioning the inevitable burdens of taxation. These latter suggestions relate themselves to the welfare of society, and raise the question whether gigantic fortunes are in themselves, or in the methods of their acquisition, such serious obstacles to the contentment, the peace, and the healthy growth of the community as to call for their abatement. We are to-day face to face with these grave and far-reaching problems. It is impossible either to avoid them or to postpone them. All that is left for us is to discuss them and to endeavor to settle them upon some sane and rational basis. It is equally futile and cowardly to pretend that they do not exist or that we need not bother ourselves about them. President Roosevelt having "set the ball rolling," it will roll on until a solution is found, fairly satisfactory to the majority of the voters,—some workable basis of agreement between those who have good reason to be contented with their generous share of the common property of the nation and those who, perhaps, have as good reason to be discontented with their meagre share of it. It is surely the part of wisdom and of patriotism to hasten the finding of such a workable basis of agreement—before it is too late.

WAYNE MAC VEAGH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EFFECTS OF SCHOOL LIFE UPON THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN.

BY GEORGE WOODRUFF JOHNSTON, M.D.

ACCORDING to the report of the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1903, there were in the United States at that time 22,655,001 children between the ages of five and eighteen, of whom 18,187,918 were enrolled in public or private schools or colleges, or in special institutions of a more or less educational character. Thus, during the period mentioned, more than twenty-two per cent. of our entire people were at school or college, and their education cost for that one year $251,457,625, or $3.15 *per capita* of population. To-day, our educational system is even larger, and the expense of maintaining it greater still.

Are these enormous sums spent wisely? Does the institution, private, municipal or State, realize that the most priceless possession of this vast multitude of boys and girls is not learning, but health; and does it so guard them during the most plastic stage of their lives that, when their school-days are over, they may enter the world well, and strong, and properly equipped physically to engage in the struggle for existence, and to become the most effective economic units possible in the community?

We do not know. Investigations touching the health of school children in the United States have been so few, superficial and fruitless that the superintendent of physical training in the Boston public schools was able, at the beginning of the present decade, to state without fear of contradiction that "it is scarcely too much to say that it would be easier under present conditions to estimate the losses entailed by hog-cholera or cattle-plague throughout the Union, than to determine the number of school children who succumb annually to school diseases in the United States." The same may be said now with almost equal truth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, by reviewing the examinations made in Europe (where the subject under discussion has received the attention it deserves), and by comparing the results obtained with those to be derived from our own scattered and inconclusive inquiries, we may seek, and perhaps find, answers to our question.

As education became widely disseminated and the standard in all grades of every kind of institution of learning was raised, the demands upon pupils became more and more exacting, until physicians began to note the constant recurrence of a series of morbid phenomena which appeared to be due to the conditions of school life. To determine the precise nature, extent and cause of these phenomena, more or less searching and comprehensive inquiries were undertaken by European investigators—by Hertel in Denmark (1881), by a Danish commission (1882), by a Swedish commission under Axel Key (1883), by a British Parliamentary commission under Crichton-Browne (1884), and by Warner, also in Great Britain (1892)—which inquiries taken together furnish information concerning the health of 104,629 school children, urban and rural, of both sexes, of different ages, and of all social conditions. To these may be added, for each has some feature of interest, the report of Zahor as to the physical condition of 4,892 pupils in the schools of Prague (1888-1890); of Nesterov, 216 pupils in the Moscow schools (1890); of Combe, 3,650 in Lausanne (1892); of Wirenius, 367 in St. Petersburg (1897); of Chalmers and others regarding the health of all the scholars in the Glasgow schools (1904-5), and of a number of special investigations referred to later on.

The methods pursued and the care exercised in these inquiries varied. Some lacked thoroughness; none was, however, wholly slipshod. In many instances, the subjects of scrutiny were examined closely and repeatedly by trained observers, and not only the child and the child's teacher, but certain features of the former's home life, were brought under investigation. In Denmark and Sweden, printed questions as to the pupil's health, the amount of home study, the character and duration of sleep, etc., were given the parents to answer. The information so obtained was submitted first to the family physician and then to the teacher for criticism, correction and amplification, and afterward the child itself was examined, weighed and its eyesight tested. In doubtful cases, the subject was called "well", and ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cidental injuries, acute or incidental illnesses, and abnormal conditions attributable to causes lying outside the school were not considered.

All the investigations enumerated, and others not herein specified, disclosed an astonishing amount of ill health among school children; and, though the variations from the norm were found to differ in degree, they were on every hand alike in kind, in nearly every instance more pronounced in girls than boys, and often most manifest in scholars of the better social classes. Thus, there were discovered the following percentages of morbidity ("morbid quality; disease; sickness") among schoolboys—in Great Britain, 20; in Denmark, 29; in Germany, 30; in Copenhagen, 31; and in Sweden, 37: the percentages noted among girls were, in Great Britain, 16; in Copenhagen, 39; in Denmark, 41; in Lausanne, 43: in Germany, 50; and in Stockholm, 62—an average morbidity for boys of 29, and for girls of 42 per cent.

This sum total of ill health was made up of a number of chronic conditions, among which may be mentioned anemia and chlorosis; lack of appetite, indigestion and impaired nutrition; relaxed skin and muscles, and muscular twitching; headache, broken sleep, neuralgia (especially of the intercostal nerves), nervousness, nerve instability, nerve exhaustion, chorea; chest pains, cardiac irritability and palpitation, nosebleed; lateral curvature of the spine, and near-sight, though the latter was not included in many of the percentages above quoted. Further, it was noted that the amount and degree of ill health increased, not with age as years are counted, but rather in direct proportion to the number of work hours, and to the increased burden of studies, as progress was made upward from grade to grade. A greater morbidity of about 6 per cent. was found to exist among pupils who worked more than the average number of hours; and in certain classes and schools, particularly in Stockholm, where the standard was exceptionally high, the average morbidity of neighboring schools was exceeded by from 3 to 10 per cent. The disparity, evident in the statistics of general morbidity above quoted, between countries so nearly alike in all respects as Sweden and Denmark, is explained in the same way—a greater number of working-hours having been required in Sweden at the time these inquiries were made.

The same conditions, doubtless, obtain in this country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Competent medical men brought to light the fact that special organs and sets of organs, as well as the general health of those attending the high schools of Cleveland, Ohio, suffered in direct ratio to the amount of study in hours; and, in twelve of our best-known colleges for women, there was a gain of 6 per cent. over the average morbidity among those who studied severely.

Thus, it may be said that:

1. At the time these inquiries were undertaken, there was a surprising amount of ill health among school children;

2. Though varying in degree, from slight functional disturbances to actual illness, the same morbid conditions were found wherever and whenever investigations were made; and

3. The percentage of morbidity rose with progress from grade to grade.

In view of these facts, the foregoing affections have been termed "school diseases." They are precisely such morbid states as the conditions of school life—especially fatigue pushed to its pathological extreme—might be expected to induce or aggravate; and, although subjects for control are lacking, inasmuch as the vast majority of children of school age go to school, yet many observers have remarked that the overworked scholar, notably in our higher school grades, is of a weaker fibre and has a less well-balanced nervous system than other members of the same family, of approximately the same age, who stay at home. Indeed, an association of collegiate women, anxious, as we might suppose, to prove the contrary, has demonstrated that, while of 705 girl graduates of America's foremost female and coeducational colleges 19.6 per cent. suffered deterioration of health during their student days, only 16.09 per cent. of 1,032 Boston working-girls of the same age had a like misfortune during the period of their greatest activity. But, after all, comparisons are needless. It is the condition itself, not its relative aspects, that is of the greatest interest and importance.

A critical study of each of the so-called school diseases is unnecessary. But it may be proper to examine a little more narrowly into one of them, to ascertain, for instance, to what extent it is met with the world over, to what degree it is influenced by school life—in brief, to discover if, as one school disease, it illustrates the principles above set down as affecting all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Headache, whether it be due to anemia, eye strain,* bad ventilation, fatigue, nerve exhaustion or what not, is, in its origin, distribution and characteristics, the most typical, perhaps, of all school diseases. Grouping information obtained from France, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark and Russia, it is apparent that from 40 to 50 per cent. of all school children suffer from this malady; and, further, that it is commonly habitual, usually frontal in location, and that girls are affected more than boys. Moreover, it was noticed that the number of scholars suffering from habitual headache increased (at a maximum rate of 6 per cent. a year) step by step and grade by grade with advancement through school; and, also, that the headache of schoolgirls began with the term, grew more frequent and intense as it progressed, and disappeared in the holidays, to reappear with the beginning of the next school term. The same effect of alternate work and rest was manifest in the London and Moscow elementary schools, where, in the former, 12 per cent. of the scholars suffered from headache in the morning, 22 per cent. in the afternoon, and in the evening, after a period of rest, only 11 per cent.

Of all the so-called school diseases, however, those affecting the nervous system are of the greatest interest to Americans, and in no other field is the connection between the morbid state, as a result, and school life, as a cause, so clear and intimate, and nowhere else is progressive deterioration so closely related to the demands made upon the scholar.

Wirenius in St. Petersburg, and Nesterov in Moscow, found that 27.5 and 29.25 per cent. of the pupils examined by them, respectively, suffered from disturbances of the nervous system. No distinctive disease marked by typical objective signs was met with by either; but there were headache (constant, or occurring at the end of the day's work), sleeplessness, various neuralgias, neuroses of the heart (palpitation, etc.), rapidly induced mental weariness accompanied by irritability and excitement, and other functional derangements chiefly of a neurasthenic character. Both observers showed also that the disorders named increased in frequency with age and advancement in school grade from a

* For phases of this subject relating to ophthalmology, gynecology, etc., and not considered here, see article by the late Dr. W. W. Johnston and the author of this paper, "Trans. Med. Soc. D. C.," 1897, II, 61.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minimum of 11 per cent. (Wirenius) and 8 per cent. (Nesterov) at ten years of age, to a maximum of 50 per cent. at eighteen years (Wirenius) and 77 per cent. at nineteen (Nesterov).

In the London schools, 11 per cent. of the children examined showed "abnormal nerve signs"—instability in posture and in balance, loss of tone in the muscles encircling the eyes, finger-twitching, stammering, numerous small movements occurring without apparent stimulation, and muscular eccentricity closely bordering on chorea; while 38 per cent. suffered from sleeplessness, with 6 per cent. of sleep-walkers and nearly 34 per cent. of sleep-talkers. The examiner was told that parents often complained that their children talked of lessons in sleep, arithmetical problems appearing to be the chief disturbing element.

In the higher girls' schools of Germany nervous affections were remarked in fully 70 per cent. of the pupils, and in 20 per cent. sleep was irregular and disturbed.

As to the prevalence of nerve disorders in the school children of the United States, we know little. We have graphic word-pictures of the nerve-sick child and abundant generalizations, but facts are few and sometimes confusing. Twenty-one years ago, an enormous increase in nervous diseases was noted in children of school age in Baltimore, and nine years ago school life was held responsible for 21 out of 150 cases of nerve derangement among Boston pupils treated in a certain hospital. Again, of 417 American college girls showing some form of ill health, 7 per cent. were afflicted with "brain troubles," 33 per cent. with nervousness, and 15 per cent. with neuralgia. One physician in New York, however, found headache and disability of the nervous system less common in grammar-schools, where the average age of scholars is twelve, than in primary schools, where the average age is seven years—the exact opposite of what has invariably been present elsewhere.

How many school children in the United States suffer from or succumb to diseases of the nervous system induced or made worse by school life, and what proportion of such affections encountered in adults originate at this earlier period, it is impossible to say. We know that, wherever careful and comprehensive investigations have been undertaken among school girls and boys, disorders of this system have been found to be numerous and of a character actually or potentially grave. We know

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that our heredity, ideals, climate, environment and habits of life predispose to such affections. We know also that the experience of one large general Boston hospital, in which 11 per cent. of 2,000 consecutive admissions were due to neurasthenia (or nervous exhaustion) alone, is not a unique, but on the contrary a common, experience. We know likewise that in the practice of every physician such maladies appear to be gaining in frequency and in severity of type, that insanity is multiplying and our asylums are overcrowded, and, finally, that the ratio of deaths from nervous diseases to deaths from all causes is constantly on the increase. These considerations, reinforced by exact data obtained in Europe, where, after all, conditions are not greatly unlike our own, may well lead us to question the influence of our school establishment upon the children committed to its care.

Many of the investigators previously quoted observed that the number of scholars diminished and the curve of morbidity declined in the highest classes of the schools examined by them. A diminution in the size of classes through the departure of those who left school to enter higher educational institutions or business life would have affected the morbidity percentage, if at all, by increasing it, the strong and successful going out, the sickly and backward remaining behind. This, therefore, cannot account for the descending morbidity curve so often noted. The true explanation lies in the fact that the delicate and ill have fallen out, unable to keep up in the race, and the robust and unyielding have remained behind at school.

This process of selection and elimination has been closely studied in Christiania and in many parts of Germany. It is going on everywhere and in every school grade. In one year more than 10 per cent., and in another nearly 20 per cent., of the public-school children examined by health officers in Boston were thus sent home. In Cleveland, 75 per cent. of the girls and 33 per cent. of the boys who left the high schools during a single year, did so because unable to keep up with their studies by reason of ill health; and in the Waltham, Massachusetts, high school, nine of a class of seventeen left in their graduating year for the same reason. One writer asserts that, in five cities of the United States, sixteen thousand children between eight and fourteen years of age were taken out of the public schools within one school term, because of ill health.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In view of the above facts regarding selection and elimination, it would not appear surprising if the girls and young women in our female and coeducational colleges exhibited a full measure of good health. It has been repeatedly maintained that they do so; and this claim is used as the basis of an argument thought to be convincing and unanswerable, namely: If girl graduates of our school system are well and continue healthy and capable, in spite of the additional tasks they are called upon to perform in college, then there is no overpressure in our schools and nothing wrong with our methods of education. This argument is fallacious. The girls here spoken of are not types of the American schoolgirl; they are the fittest who have survived.

And, again, it has not been satisfactorily proven that the picked college girl is better off physically than the ordinary schoolgirl. Her burdens rest, proportionately, as heavily upon her as those imposed upon her more plastic and less resistant sister in school, and she bends under them in precisely the same way. Of 705 graduates of twelve of our best-known institutions, including Vassar, Smith, Cornell, etc., 19.6 per cent. lost health during their college days, and 59 per cent. of the whole suffered from some mental or physical disorder after graduation. These figures are striking as compared with the average of 42 per cent. morbidity among girls in the most severely taxed schools in Europe. Further, of these 705 graduates, 26 per cent. married, of whom 37 per cent. were childless at the end of six years of married life. Those who became mothers brought an average of less than two children each into the world, and of these 12 per cent. died at or immediately after birth.

As to the origin of the various forms of ill health prevailing among school children, no one contends that there is but one cause, or that of the many possible or probable causes all lie within the school. Not every child is physically robust when he begins his studies. Before that time and during his whole school life he is influenced by heredity, by home environment, and by a thousand conditions which have nothing to do with the school.

Upon one point, however, the statistics of morbidity previously quoted are distinctly illuminating. No matter what the age, sex, social condition or home life of the pupil; no matter where he may live, nor in what manner of school building he may be housed; no matter how good or bad the heat, light or ventila-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, how unsuitable the desks, how high the stairs; no matter if much of the study be done outside of the school proper, one rule always holds good—the percentage of morbidity increases in direct ratio to the amount of study in hours; and, inasmuch as the sum total of ill health is made up of many different units, there is found, wherever intellectual overstrain exists, not only a gain in the number of the fragile and the ill, but also in the variety of morbid states present, and a more pronounced severity in their type. Hence, it is fair to conclude that fatigue is the determining cause of many school diseases, and aggravates most or all of them.

The term "fatigue," so vague as popularly used, describes a condition whose origin, nature and results have been minutely studied and are not without general interest. The simplest mental process or the slightest bodily movement is impossible without some physical change in the nerve cells that produced or in any way had to do with it, and some destruction of living tissue. The products of such destruction benumb and poison every nerve cell with which they come into contact; and since they are picked up, whirled away and distributed by the circulating blood throughout the entire organism, not only the cells directly concerned and at the immediate site of the described impulse or activity, but all nerve cells within the body, are affected. Thus, while severe mental labor (though the student sit or lie calmly and comfortably), or active exercise of a single muscle or group of muscles (though the remainder of the body be at perfect rest), results in brain fatigue in the one case or fatigue of the special muscle or set of muscles in the other, yet in every instance there inevitably follow weariness and lassitude that are general and felt throughout the entire economy. Provide a period of rest and relaxation, and nature rapidly eliminates these waste products through the proper channels, and exhaustion is followed by refreshment. Keep up the strain, or repeat it with undue frequency, and cells and tissues are continuously poisoned and suffer actual demonstrable changes in their texture and constitution which may never disappear, but, on the contrary, may forever inhibit their activity and effectiveness. Certain birds are so sensitive to fatigue that if, after a day's work in search of food, they are kept awake and in movement throughout the ensuing night, death follows. Children are exceedingly susceptible,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the reason that none of their tissues has attained full development, strength or stability. Hence, they fare ill if school-work is severe or prolonged, and if periods of rest are infrequent or not of adequate length.

The rapidity with which fatigue shows itself is well illustrated by the experiments of Buergerstein, who gave to a number of school children, in the first hour of the first day's work in a week, a series of equally simple mathematical problems, and who found that the period required for and the difficulties attending their solution (the latter as evidenced by the number of errors undetected by the scholar, or discovered and rectified by him) increased *pari passu* with the flight of time, and reached their maximum in the third quarter of the hour of the experiment.

Conversely, the readiness with which fatigue yields to proper rest or diversion, and the increase in capacity resulting therefrom, are well shown by the fact that, up to a certain point, the shorter the period of study, and the more frequent and prolonged the interval of rest, the greater the quantity and the better the quality of work done. In many cities where limited school-house capacity has made half-day sessions necessary, teachers have been astonished to discover that twice as much work was accomplished as under the old plan, and with far less weariness and worry.

The presence of fatigue can be detected readily by simple objective signs, and its degree can be measured with something like mathematical precision. If we strap (palm upward) one forearm and hand of the pupil to a table-top, fasten to the index-finger a string, running over a pulley, with a weight attached to the other end, and affix to the weight a needle whose point is in contact with a moving drum, we can ascertain and register the amount of local or general fatigue from which the subject suffers. When the pupil rises in the morning, refreshed by a night's sleep, the index-finger by being flexed can raise the weight so many times to such heights in so many minutes, and a certain curve will be registered on the drum. Tire the arm or hand, and the curve changes. Weary the brain by mental labor, exhaust the emotions by anxiety, fear or what not, the arm, hand and entire body remaining at rest, and the index-finger fails in strength and endurance, and the curve shows line by line the existence and degree of fatigue.

Supplement this physiological demonstration by microscopic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

examination of the nerve cells of birds or animals which have undergone certain activities, and corresponding nerve cells in kindred (control) birds or animals which have remained at rest, and the existence, and to a certain extent the degree, of fatigue experienced by the former during life will become evident through the changes that have taken place in structure, and the response or lack of response to certain chemical stains. The work of Hodge illustrates these points clearly. He examined nerve cells in the brain and spine of sparrows killed early in the morning and found them sound; while similar cells of other sparrows killed in the evening, after their day's work in quest of food, showed changes in conformation and in reaction to stains. Even birds which had spent a rainy day under tree shelter, and which, having been supplied with food, were called upon for practically no bodily effort, showed pronounced anatomical changes in their cortical brain cells as the result of their mental activities.

It can be readily seen from what has gone before how fatigue dulls the mind and tires the body of the school child, how the nervous system, in its extreme sensitiveness and lack of development and resistance, chiefly suffers, and how the impress of fatigue upon it may become deep and indelible. A nervous system repeatedly jaded by undue fatigue is constantly subjected to a greater and greater tax as the pupil advances from class to class and the burden of work is increased, until perhaps the weight of a hair will decide his fate, and he is either immediately incapacitated for further effort, or enters life with a nervous system so overwrought, unstable and exhausted that, though years may elapse, a single physical or emotional crisis precipitates him into the slough of chronic invalidism.

The remedy for conditions which we know to exist in Europe and which we have every reason to believe are met with in the same or even greater degree in this country, lies not in the almost professional athleticism which is now the vogue; for in this it is evident we are merely substituting for one form of fatigue another no less injurious, but rather in a completer comprehension of the school child as a young animal at work and play, and a rational adaptation of work and play to his capacities and needs. In this way only can he be made fit for the real struggle awaiting him, and become in the community in which his lot is cast a valuable economic unit. GEORGE WOODRUFF JOHNSTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIAL IDEALS.—I.*

BY CHARLES WALDSTEIN, PROFESSOR IN CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY (CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY) AND FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

MRS. WHARTON'S remarkable novel is a tragedy. It is a tragedy, not only because it ends with the death of the heroine, but because the heroine loses life's greatest prizes—the true love of a lover and her own self-esteem. She loses what every human soul more or less consciously strives for, a deep and at once concentrated and reciprocated affection of a kindred human being, free from, and above, all worldly and conventional considerations; and she loses this because of conditions which are ephemeral and fortuitous. She also loses the all-pervading moral sense of the harmonious relation between her actual life and the ideal of that life which dominates the soul of every human being with greater or less clearness and consciousness. It is upon this harmony of our moral sense that our self-esteem depends. It is a soul's tragedy. But the essential element in a tragedy as a work of art is that it should force the reader or spectator into sympathy with the fate which is developed before his eyes. This is the true poetic justice in literature; not so much that the guilty should be punished, as that our sympathy and our emotions should be justified by the artistic presentation, the artistic form.

The story of the tragic fate of Lily Bart, living in fashionable New York society, could not evoke our interest, culminating in our sympathy, if the conditions which lead her to her ruin were not clearly impressed upon us by the necessary conditions of her own life and did not in so far "justify" her fate. We cannot sympathize with *Monstra:* they may help to interest us in a spec-

* This essay was suggested by the reading of Mrs. Edith Wharton's "The House of Mirth."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tacular display, but they cannot form the centre of interest in a tragedy which is to move us to sympathy and to pity. Becky Sharp could not for a moment hold our interest in suspense, if the conditions of her breeding and early life, and the circumstances under which, thus prepared, she is placed, did not fully account for, if not justify, her failings, her life, and her deeds. Lily has nothing of the Becky Sharp in her. She is in many respects the very opposite of Thackeray's heroine. She is essentially lovable, good-natured by disposition, beautiful and attractive, and, for the most part, up to the very moment of her tragedy, she is pampered by fashionable society. Her temperament, the inherited traditions of her early life are the opposite of those of Becky. Her great trials came at the end of her life, while those of Becky Sharp came at the beginning. We might almost venture to surmise that, if Lily had begun her life as a poor girl in a boarding-school, she would at once have gained and held the affection or, at least, the unstinted admiration of those about her. And if in her adult existence she had been forced to battle with manifest poverty and had gone through the discipline of earning her own livelihood as a teacher in a school, her whole nature might have developed generously and on large lines. Still, as with Becky, her life is decided by the peculiar influence of her early bringing-up and her later existence upon her elementary personality.

Lily Bart was born into the life of the wealthy merchant class of New York, the daughter of an assertive, worldly and selfish mother who dominated the family life. Her father was a simple business man, unassertive in his home; his main justification for his existence appears to have been to produce the means for the satisfaction of his wife's worldly ambitions. Lily's misfortune, moreover, was her remarkable and effective beauty, destined by its quality to confer upon her preeminence in the social glitter of that wealthy society, which seemed the natural setting or background for her physical attractiveness. With this she possessed a natural taste for dress and the grace of wearing it. In the eyes of the world she was destined to make "a great match." From her earliest days, in her home she has constantly and exclusively impressed upon her the vulgar and hard-hearted ideals (if one dare call them so) of this worldly and restricted society. The subsequent tragedy of her life is prepared when her father

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dies after failing in business, and her mother is left alone with her beautiful daughter, her means sorely restricted, while her tastes and ambitions remain unabated. Lily's early girlhood is spent in travelling about, the main object of her mother being to evade, or at least hide, all the struggles to maintain for her brilliant daughter an adequate position in the circles of smart people among whom they both move. The girl has had no opportunity to realize higher and nobler ideals of life; while she has constantly instilled into her, as an almost physical characteristic, the thoroughly ingrained need of elegance and the revulsion from all that is dowdy or inelegant. After the death of her mother, as a beautiful and attractive young lady with good social connections in New York she soon becomes a pampered and prominent figure in the smartest and wealthiest of these sets. She becomes the friend of the wealthy women who set the tone in the luxurious life of the flashy New York *haute finance*—if the term "friendship" can be applied to the shallow and rootless relationship which she holds to her intimates among the women. With her small competence, however, she can only maintain herself properly in this circle by receiving certain indirect additions to her finances from her women friends, for which, without manifest compact, she renders corresponding services of an undefined nature as a kind of social assistant, manageress, mistress of the ceremonies and occasional private secretary without office. In spite of the deeper and nobler qualities in her nature, hitherto dormant, Lily feels herself comfortable in these elegant surroundings; they have become, in fact, almost an essential need of her nature. Moreover, the hard and indelicately clear manner in which, in her mother's home and in her later environment, the mercenary aspect of matrimony and love is regarded has blunted her inherent refinement of mind, if not of heart; so that she clearly faces and accepts the view held by those about her, that her ultimate destiny must be to marry one of the richest men in that circle. As the authoress says of her, when she has escaped from a very "doubtful" position:

"She had rejected Rosedale's suggestion with a promptness of scorn almost surprising to herself: she had not lost her capacity for high flashes of indignation. But she could not breathe long on the heights; there had been nothing in her training to develop any continuity of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moral strength: what she craved, and really felt herself entitled to, was a situation in which the noblest attitude should also be the easiest. Hitherto, her intermittent impulses of resistance had sufficed to maintain her self-respect. If she slipped, she recovered her footing; and it was only afterward that she was aware of having recovered it each time on a slightly lower level. She had rejected Rosedale's offer without conscious effort; her whole being had risen against it; and she did not yet perceive that, by the mere act of listening to him, she had learned to live with ideas which would once have been intolerable to her."

Lily does not marry one of the millionaires, though the opportunities were immediately within her reach, and though she had clearly accepted such a destiny as her natural one. The real cause of this failure gives the key-note of the whole work, cleverly struck at the very beginning of the story—her love for the man who appears above the horizon of the world in which she moves, though he also moves in it with a native refinement and a depth which have withstood its tarnishing and shallowing influences. He despises that world in his heart, though it has certainly affected his life and his fate, if not his character. Of this love, which subconsciously acts as a restraining power and at the last moment prevents her from marrying a millionaire without love on more than one occasion, both he and she only become fully and mutually conscious when the tragedy is almost inevitably approaching its climax.

Meanwhile, the conditions of the social life in which she moves have placed her in a succession of false positions which gradually tend to compromise her in the eyes of even that world. Her finances become involved, she is dropped by most of her "elegant friends," and is reduced to pecuniary straits which force her to give up the luxuries that have become second nature, and bring her to the verge of actual want. Forsaken and alone and almost despised, having sunk gradually from the highest pinnacle of vulgarly manifest smartness, through intermediate "social" stages, to association with people of doubtful respectability, she at last ends her own life just as she realizes what true love means. She does this in a tragically dramatic situation which it would be wrong to forestall in a dry and inadequate paraphrase, and which I must leave the reader to realize for himself in this beautifully written book. The book is in all essentials a tragedy.

In all times, the central and distinctive feature of a tragedy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been that it represents the struggle of the Individual against the Universal, and that the individual is crushed. This idea of the Universal may be expressed in the form of the Divine Power, the gods, or Fate as decreed by them, or laws created by their sanction, or by Society representing these laws. It is a conflict of the individual against the crushing power of these general forces that constitutes the decisive feature of tragedy with the ancients; the progression from the direct manifestation of the gods to the more human sphere of social laws is marked by the three great tragic writers: Æschylus, in whose dramas we more directly feel the intervention of the gods; Sophocles, where fate manifests itself in the form of immutable laws; Euripides, where the human origin of these laws is more perceptible. This conflict and its tragic end, implying as they do the contravention of the highest social laws, imply some crime or fault or at least mistake on the part of the suffering hero. But, to evoke our sympathy and our pity, the definite contravention must not be an immediate act of his conscious will; but it must be caused by some outer concatenation of circumstances which takes the form of fate from which he cannot escape, some overwhelming passion, justifying the act by its elemental forcefulness, or some mistake of judgment which for the time has blinded the eyes from perceiving and realizing the great general laws. Yet, in the Greek drama, these crimes or passions or errors of the individual tend to confirm the strength and validity of the general laws, they make them appear immutable as rocks upon which the fabric of organized society was erected for the ancient world. Their dramas are thus "ἠθικόι," moral. Even with the Greeks, however, in the progression I enumerated above, the tendency grows to eliminate the supranatural element in the conception of these general laws; though we must never forget that the supranatural with the Greeks never was fantastic, because their gods and all their mythological conceptions were naturalistic.

In the modern era of the drama, ushered in by Shakespeare, this tendency towards a purely human basis for the events enacted grows constantly more marked. Human society becomes more directly and manifestly the authority for the laws and the forces against which the individual struggles in tragic conflict. At the same time, the "justification," upon which our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sympathy is based, is more and more manifestly to be found in the *character of the hero.* The conflict must be accounted for, dramatically justified, in the character with which the hero is born. And the most noteworthy consequence of these changes is that, in the presentation of the society which produced the general laws, the element of absoluteness, of immutability, which the supranatural element added to the Greek conceptions, is weakened. In Shakespeare, whatever the strength with which he endows the surrounding forces against which the individual character struggles, we have the suggestion that these change and are not absolute, because they have a national and an historical character.

This process from the ancient to the modern drama is thus one of artistic individualization, a general process which we can notice in the development of all arts. In the drama this process applies both to the drawing of character and to the drawing of "society." The finer shading, the emphasizing of individual features, the precision in the expression of attributes, which mark the development of the modern drama, have no doubt been brought about through the instrumentality of the novel, which has accustomed the public to a fuller presentation of character in growth and development, in its relation to surroundings and in the depiction of the various situations.* But if this greater individualization applies to the presentation of character, it also emphatically applies to the drawing of general society and its laws. With the growth and facility of intercommunication between the various nationalities, each nation has become cognizant of the national character of the other countries and distinctly conscious of its own; and this knowledge has become a matter of artistic interest to each. At the same time, the familiarity with the past through the study of history, and the keen interest thus aroused, have created an artistic taste for the apprehension of the distinct characteristics of various periods

* The dogmatic student of "Æsthetics," who takes Lessing's Laocoon as his canonical standard, does not always realize how the several arts influence one another. They do this indirectly, in that a certain standard or form of presentation is fixed in the minds of the public by one art, and this modifies the demand with regard to another art, though that art may be based upon different principles and appeal through different organs of sense. I shall, therefore, allow both drama and novel to illustrate my point. Perhaps I ought to remark that, of course, there are other forms of the novel besides the "dramatic novel," but with these I do not deal here.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in man's past. Instead of General Human Society, we thus have French, German, English, American Society, and, moreover, the national society and social atmosphere of one period in these countries, or even the different districts and centres of life within the same community. Balzac does not only depict the society of France in a given period, but he distinguishes between the life of the metropolis and the life of the provinces; Zola gives facts dealing with the French life of the Second Empire as a whole. Anatole France makes the delicate interaction between the contemporary life and social atmosphere of France upon M. Bergeret the centre of his vivid drawing of the inner struggles of a modern scholar. Mr. George Meredith with passionate insistence depicts the conflict between the vividly drawn provincialism of the England of his youth and its hatred of ideas, and the world of wider and deeper ideas and truer feelings which actuate his heroes, and, especially, his heroines. George Eliot, in every one of her stories as well as in her scenes of provincial or clerical life, shows the same conflict, nowhere more dramatically than when the passionate soul of Maggie Tulliver is wrecked by the hard rule of the Mill on the Floss which typifies the provincial conventions of the English country life into which she was born. Gogol, Tourgenieff, Tolstoy, Gorky do the same for Russia. In the best German novels, from Otto Ludwig to Franzen, we have the same central feature of dramatic conflict. From the plays of the elder and younger Dumas down to Pailleron's masterly drawing of the "*Monde où l'on s'ennuie,*" we have a process of finer drawing of the "social" background.

This process of individualization as regards the social environment does not end with the nation or period: society as a general power, weighing upon the individual and affecting his fate, becomes attenuated to a class, nay to a "set"; and the "immutable laws" of society more and more tend to become the conventions of a set. The struggle of the individual against the universal is then no longer the struggle of the human heart and of individual life against immutable laws; but against what the actor himself, as well as the audience, may recognize to be *convention*. This forms the key-note to the compositions of Ibsen and his school. The process of differentiation goes still further: general society, which forms the environment to the soul's drama, may be represented by one aspect of modern life,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as with Hauptmann, with Zola, with Norris; it may be a dominant economical movement, the struggle of capital and labor, the establishment of the universal provider in opposition to the small shop, the conditions of the miner, the influence of drink, etc. Nay, the distinct national laws or standards or conventions, such as those of American and European society, may in their complex fusion become a determining factor of general life pressing upon individual life, as with Mr. Henry James the common land of European and American social standards and ideals becomes itself the complex social arena in which the living actors move and struggle in unbloody, but none the less tragic, conflict. In Æschylus we had the struggle against the will of the gods, in Sophocles against the social laws, in Ibsen against the conventions of the day and in Henry James against the confusing complexity of international standards and conventions.

Thus the ruling laws, the social background, the pervading atmosphere in which the life and conflict of the tragic hero are placed, become more and more prominent and more and more manifestly, sensuously drawn; until a great deal, if not a preponderance, of the interest is shifted to the environment, and the individual characters often receive their artistic right of existence because they are the bearers of these corporate entities, of social ideas or forces or movements. Drink or a strike or the problems of transportation become the heroes in the novels and plays of Zola, of Gerhard Hauptmann and of Norris.

The environment, social as well as material, thus dominates, nay even creates, the individual.

Whether it be a mere coincidence or a casual connection or—what seems to me more likely—the result of the spirit of the age, it is in the age of Charles Darwin that the influence of the environment, in essentially modifying, if not in producing, a definite character, is made a distinct literary element. With writers like Ibsen and Zola, the application of these principles of evolution and heredity becomes inartistically manifest and is often obtruded with an amateurish exaggeration and directness. Yet, though the study of evolution and heredity may thus have led to exaggeration and abuse, the modern reading public has not only become prepared to understand most of such influences upon the formation of character, but the knowledge of them has become so familiar and has given such a general tone to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consciousness of the thoughtful public, that the scientific attitude of mind has indirectly affected the artistic treatment of life. It has been especially active in the dramatic novel. Though, on the one hand, the dramatic conflict lies between the individual, his rights, his passions, his natural interests, and the conventions of a narrow society, the conflict is converted, on the other hand, into a struggle between a "set"-created type, the child of *a* society, and the lasting general human laws —between *a* society and society. Perhaps more accurately defined, the struggle lies between the ideals, the standards or, at least, the aspirations of a narrow society or set and those of human society as a whole. And, when we have to deal with a soul's tragedy, it may often mean the struggle in one and the same individual between the two ideals, the two standards, the two groups of aspirations within it. When at the end the victim realizes that the lower forces have prevailed, then it is a tragedy.

This is the tragic element in Mrs. Wharton's story, as it is in so many noted works in modern fiction. The child's soul is formed and the woman's life is fashioned by the outer social world in which they are placed. We run dangerously near to cant when we say that the most important element in the formation of a character—its education—and the direction of a life's course—its associations and activities—are the ideals which are instilled and the ideals which surround. If we could know the day-dreams of a child—nay, of the grown-up child as well —the part which it imagines itself to play in the world of its desires, the secret ambitions which are hatched in the moments of silent reverie, we should know more about what that child is and what it is to become than by anything said or done, by any effort or achievement.

Now, it is not so much through the channels of the intellect that this fountain of future effort and desire and ambition, which direct the course of the whole life, is fed and courses through our life-blood. It is directly through our emotional nature and our imagination; through what stirs our feelings and appeals to our imagination; through our environment, our home; through our plays and games, physical and moral and intellectual; through what we read—not in connection with work in school hours, but with the relaxation of play and repose that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make the heart sensitive in our leisure hours. Here lies the responsibility of the home, the whole home, not the nursery only, and still less the school. Here also lies the ethical importance of the literature we read,—not so much that it should only deal with nice and brilliant things and people, and avoid the truth of life and the life of common people who are far from brilliant, who may even be vicious; but that the general spirit and moral tone *within the work itself,* and the ultimate ideals dominating the writer himself, which flow into his work involuntarily and give it its elevating stamp, should be moral.

These ambitions of life, these social ideals, are also directly transmitted to the young by those who are about them in their home, those whom they admire and look up to. Yet they are not transmitted directly by preaching, not through the intellect, through the momentary comprehension of the idea itself; but habitually, by continuous repercussion of example, until it pervades the whole surroundings of life, the moral atmosphere, which æsthetically filters through the senses into the emotions, deep down into the character, and gives substance and direction to the imagination. It is what we call the "tone" of a social group and of a home. This tone may be true and noble, strong and refined; or it may be false and ignoble, weak and vulgar. And this tone ultimately derives its character and substance from the morality which is at the bottom of the life, of the ambitions and aspirations, of those who dominate it. I am not using the word "morality" in the restricted sense which we are wont to apply to it nowadays; but as the consciousness of the truest laws which the clearest mind, free from self-deception, can recognize as worthy of ruling the social life of the times in which we live, so clearly perceived that they can be applied to the deepest, weightiest and highest, as well as to the most superficial, lightest and most lowly conditions of our existence. Not the laws of a set, but the laws of society.

Yet the disease which leads to tragic issues is often to be found in the fact that this wide conception of society has degenerated in the minds and hearts of shallow and vulgar-minded people, until its big meaning and purport are entirely lost, and it merely comes to mean the outer tinsel and glittering attributes of a group of wealthy people, who stand prominently before the eyes of the public on a pinnacle of newspaper publicity, in which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their trivial acts and the articles of their apparel are heralded to a gaping and envious crowd. These are the people who then set the "tone" for a whole nation, a tone which reverberates through the streets and slums of cities into the very country lanes, penetrating into the homes of every class, intruding into the harmony of their existence, and often ending in its distant echo with a discord which turns life into low comedy and sometimes into tragedy.

The word "society," which we have hitherto applied in a deeper signification, comes then to stand for what has been called the *Beau Monde* and, as an adjective, *mondain*, worldly, fashionable. We meet it in literature in the phrase "a woman of fashion" and "a man of fashion." We feel a kind of hesitation in dealing seriously with such a condition of things; there is even a kind of self-deceiving insincerity which leads us to deny, or, at all events, to ignore, the existence of such a definite force in actual life. Why is this? Why does our taste revolt against dealing with it explicitly, as if we felt it to be something indelicate? Perhaps it is that we feel we are offending against our sense of proportion by fixing and confirming, by giving substantial weight to, something that is evanescent and immaterial and illusory. We may rightly feel that its power mainly consists in the recognition which it receives; and that the only way not to confirm it, is to ignore it, instead of endowing it with serious existence by such notice. And, all the time, those who observe life must realize that this idea of society is a power, a great power, to the vast mass of people.

In older days, when there were no railways and telegraphs and no newspapers, the *monde* was small and more confined in its recognizability and influence than it is now. The capitals, London itself, were comparatively small, and the Courts dominated the life of the capitals more directly with contiguous ascendency. The Counties had more material social solidarity, and the leading gentry there danced complacently to their own established good tone. There was more marked exclusiveness, and therefore less interference, between the different circles, and more internal repose. This compact internal social life did therefore not become cognizant to any marked degree of its external appearance, or, at all events, it remained indifferent to it; and thus standards of a more inward and higher character

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could become fixed within its body. All this has been changed through the growth in size of the social centres, through facile intercommunication and transportation. All boundaries have been broken through. There are so many "tones" that their complexity produces a confused noise, and no one is dominantly recognizable. Two forces alone have remained to give dominance to the tone of "fashionable society": money and the press.

There is an old German saying that two things cannot be hidden, wealth and poverty. Great wealth can certainly make itself seen and heard and by some means or other attract the eyes, and more than the eyes, at great distances. The brilliancy which it can bring in its train can be transmitted from one distant country to the other; homes can be established, entertainments given, prominence bought. And then comes the press to help it, and its dazzling effects are sent, as it were, by wireless telegraphy into the homes of even the humblest *bourgeois*. And behold! the tone is set which may affect the life of the homes and the imagination of the pure child that lives in them! This becomes a force, a great force affecting the life of a whole nation—the nation's ideals. The writer was told by one of the leading representatives of politics in the United States, when he had just returned from an extensive tour of public speaking, that he found it hard to arouse enthusiasm for, or even interest in, the important questions he wished to bring before the people; that, even in small towns in the Far West, the newspapers would devote but little space to the account of such political discussions, while they devoted columns to the narrative of Newport doings: who was present at the X's dinners and the Y's dance and the Polo match, and what the people wore.

Now, this "society," this *beau monde,* which has replaced the deep conception of society in setting the standards and laws of civilized communities, as Mrs. Wharton describes it in New York, exists everywhere. It is no longer beautiful with the background of chivalry; it is essentially vulgar in its taste and in its influences. The tone is illiterate and uninteresting; there is only the brilliancy of wealth and the glitter of jewels. What there is of ingenuity is to be found in devising new and splendid forms of entertainment; and herein the native inventiveness manifests itself in ministering to the pampered palates of those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who have an insatiable hunger for entertainment. But this entertainment is always *mouvementé,* never reposeful, never calculated for people when they are alone or in smaller groups. There is manifest in the life of these people the hypertrophy of the gregarious instinct; there is no time allowed in the programme of such house parties for restful seclusion with a book or a lonely walk or ride; only, perhaps, in the hours of the morning, when the women rise late and the men rush off to Wall Street, is there seclusion and peace. The presence of Wall Street is felt permeating the whole,—the most brilliant of *fêtes champêtres,* a cruise on the wide expanse of sea, a ride through country lanes. Though Mrs. Wharton has with delicacy shrunk from obtruding it grossly, she has made use of it in the fate of her heroine in a complicated and dramatic situation. Nor has she entered into the doubtful processes of financial enterprise and promotion which permeate this world of Wall Street and often bring us near the border-land of Queer Street, if not of criminality. But in reading the book we feel in the back of our heads the possibility of a state of affairs which the recent revelations in the management of Life-Insurance Companies have actually shown to enter into the sphere of these most prominent leaders of New York "fashionable life."

Yet all this is kept apart, as much as is possible, from the actual domestic and social life of these rich people. The highest qualities there attained to are those of comfort and elegance and luxury. These are the gods whom they worship. And thus the brilliancy of their appearance is made manifest to the widest public in the streets, and through the press reports of their internal gatherings they rise in dazzling splendor and brilliancy before the impressionable eyes of the world outside and leave a stamp upon the desires and ambitions of thousands of girls and women. These influences distorted the nature of Madame Bovary as a girl and led to her tragic doom, as they fascinated as a child the heroine of Daudet's "*Fromont Jeune et Risler Aîmé,*" drawing her to the gilt railings of the gate leading into the splendid "hotel" of the rich, and eating her heart out in covetousness as she dreamt of the luxury within.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME ARGUMENTS AGAINST MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP.

BY F. B. THURBER.

THERE are two sides to most questions, and municipal ownership is no exception to this rule. There are situations in countries having a form of government different from ours, where graft is not an epidemic disease, and where public ownership and operation may be successful; but even there opinions differ. In Great Britain it has run its course, and there is a reaction in public opinion against "municipal trading," as it is called there, just at a time when many well-meaning persons in this country, as well as professed Socialists and their organs, are advocating it here.

In a country with universal suffrage, it is desirable to limit the number of public officials to the smallest possible number, for political reasons; and there are also economic reasons which apply especially to lighting, traction and other public-service corporations which are large buyers of materials, employ large numbers of persons and require a high order of administrative ability. Indeed, water, a natural product, which runs down-hill and is distributed with a minimum of labor and expense, is about the only public necessity justifying public ownership in this country, and even in this there are exceptions.

Nothing can be truer, as a rule, than that "public-ownership waste exceeds corporate profit"; supplement this with the even more important political considerations, and thoughtful citizens may well hesitate to favor the present Socialistic fad of municipal ownership. Its advocates play upon public prejudice, and claim economies for public ownership which do not exist.

Public officials where municipal plants have been established are naturally interested in making a good showing and holding

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their easy jobs; in many instances, their bookkeeping omits interest, taxes, depreciation, sinking-fund for renewals or improvements, and other items which a private corporation must recognize. The taxpayer is a convenient beast of burden upon which to unload deficits, and he in turn unloads on rentpayers where he can. Under public ownership, new inventions, improvements and extensions are ignored. Under private ownership, the best professional talent is employed at salaries unheard of in public employment, and all these improvements are at once utilized, giving the public an up-to-date service.

Individual initiative and energy, coupled with the cooperation of many small partners in corporations, has made this country great; and I cannot believe that the municipal Socialistic propaganda will largely prevail if the facts are properly presented to the jury of American public opinion.

As illustrative of the above points, I cite a few opinions of others, taking up first:

Political Objections.

"The Evening Post" (New York) of March 8th, 1905, in an editorial on the strike in the Subway and on the Elevated Railway, entitled "Some Lessons of the Strike," said:

"Nor can we omit to point the warning which the strike furnishes against municipal ownership of a great transport system. One thing which the infatuated strike-leaders have steadily counted upon is Mr. Belmont's political involvements. They have repeatedly raided him in the confidence that he dared not antagonize 7,000 voters. Now, imagine the city itself—that is, a Mayor standing for reelection—running all the transportation lines. Fancy 12,000 or 20,000 motormen and conductors directly in the pay of the municipality. What demands should we not see made, what threats indulged in, what political appeals made and terrorism exerted! From what is going on in the green tree of ownership by a politician, we may infer what would be done in the dry tree of ownership by an Administration dependent on universal suffrage. We had best look twice at that fire before jumping into it out of our present frying-pan."

The "Chicago Evening Post" of September 15th, 1905, in an editorial entitled "The Bridgetender's Rake-off," shows how municipal ownership and operation work in Chicago. It said:

"As the taxpayer reads the facts and figures presented by the 'Evening Post' of yesterday regarding the salaries paid to the city bridgetenders,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he will be particularly impressed by the 'rake-off' that goes to the occupants of these 'soft snaps'—the amount of money drawn from the city treasury that is not earned.

"The taxpayer who knows little about practical politics will wonder why a man should be paid $3,400 a year to look after a bridge, pay out about half of this to have the work done, pocket the other half and devote his time to running a saloon or some other purely private matter. He will marvel that a bridgetender, who at most is nothing but a motorman, should draw several times a motorman's pay, yet do no part of a motorman's work.

"There is not a bridge in Chicago that should not be handled at an outside cost of $3,000 a year—considering that three or four months the work of attending to bridges is merely nominal. It has been shown that one bridgetender is clearing $155 a month out of his $2,700 salary; another is pocketing $1,840 a year out of $3,400; still another is netting fully $1,000 annually out of his $283.33 a month.

"This is a reckless way to play with the people's money. Even the city authorities who are responsible for the salaries and the selection of the men to whom they are paid show they are ashamed of the whole 'grafting' business by their reluctance to let the people scrutinize the bridgetenders' pay-roll.

"The shameful condition so fully exposed by the 'Evening Post' should be changed without delay. The Mayor and City Council ought to join hands in a bit of reform that would be immediately to the benefit of the public treasury. The Mayor should limit the number of bridgetenders to actual requirements, and he should see that every man earns his pay. The Council should limit the appropriation for this work, so as to leave no opportunity for grafting.

"The bridgetender should be required to attend to bridges, to look after them thoroughly. He should have no time for practical politics or for running a saloon. And for this work, faithfully done, he should receive a fair salary.

"Stop this bridgetenders' graft. Cut out the practical politician's rake-off. Mayor Dunne, who proposes to bring the street railroads under the same management as the city bridges, should be particularly anxious first of all to reform this especially glaring evidence of loose municipal operation."

As illustrating how persons who know only one side of a question change their minds after seeing the other side, the following editorial, entitled "The Conversion of the Scot," from the "New York Times" of June 15th, 1905, is pertinent:

"Mr. James Dalrymple, Glasgow's managing expert of tramways, hailed and imported by the 'Lord Mayor' of Chicago and the Municipal Ownership League of New York as the high apostle of municipal-run street railways, has experienced a conversion and given his adorers a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chill. His change of prospect from the fair municipal landscape of Glasgow to the political bogs and quagmires of Chicago is marked by the following two utterances, the first delivered just after Mr. Dalrymple landed and was hugged by the Leaguers in this city, the other on his way back on Tuesday *viâ* Philadelphia:

BEFORE.	AFTER.
"I see no reason why Chicago, or any other city in this country, should not be able to own its street railways, and to run them with as much success as we have achieved at Glasgow. I admit that the proposition at Chicago is a much larger one than the one we had to tackle, but at the bottom it is the same. "The people of Glasgow would not go back to the old days of private ownership for anything in the world. I am not saying that a company would not do as well by the public. I know, in fact, that it could, but it would be doing so with a somewhat different end in view. For a company has always the shareholders to consider. And I have to admit that you will find people in Glasgow to-day—quite influential people, too—who say that the street-car service is not profitable."	"To put street railroads, gas-works, telephone companies, etc., under municipal ownership would be to create a political machine in every large city that would be simply impregnable. These political machines are already strong enough with their control of policemen, firemen, and other office-holders. "If, in addition to this, they could control the thousands of men employed in the great public-utility corporations, the political machines would have a power that could not be overthrown. I came to this country a believer in public ownership. What I have seen here, and I have studied the situation carefully, makes me realize that private ownership under proper conditions is far better for the citizens of American cities."

Economic Considerations.

The experience of the City of Philadelphia with her gas-works is interesting, because she has both operated and leased them; and the results have a bearing upon both the political and economic phases of this subject.

For many years, the city owned and operated its gas-works, with the result of high prices, poor service and the gradual development of a political ring which robbed the city and practically dominated its politics. This grew so intolerable that, ten years ago, the works were leased to the United Gas Improvement Company. Hays Robbins, in an article in the "World of To-day," December, 1904, says:

"During the late seventies and early eighties, the waste and mismanagement under this [municipal operation] system became so scandalous that public-spirited citizens, notably the well-remembered Committee of One Hundred, dared the power of the gas ring and fearlessly exposed its shameful record. Professor Bryce says that this ring controlled no less than 20,000 votes, using them most effectively to prolong its corrupt rule."

The result of the lease to the United Gas Improvement Company has been to improve the service, lower the price and give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the city a yearly revenue of $650,000, as against an average yearly deficit under city management of $239,000.

The candle-power under city management averaged 19.17; under the Company management it has averaged 22.88. Thousands of service connections which were worn out or inadequate in size to supply sufficient gas have been renewed, convenient stations for the payment of gas bills furnished, and the plant brought up to the highest efficiency.

But, while accomplishing this great gain by taking the gas-works out of politics, the city did not entirely escape the evils of municipal ring rule which developed in other directions, and has only recently been broken by another uprising of citizens. Some people have inferred that the recent political revolution in Philadelphia had something to do with the gas business, but it was only in the sense that the political ring controlling the city, needing more revenue to carry on extravagant and fraudulent public improvements which they had inaugurated, approached the United Gas Improvement Company with an offer to extend their lease, provided the Gas Company would raise $25,000,000 for the ring to carry on the city improvements which were under way. After a long negotiation, the Gas Company consented to a contract which good judges believe would (if the money could have been honestly expended) have been advantageous to the city as well as to the Gas Company. But the abuses of the municipal ring had become such a stench in the nostrils of the community that the public revolted and the ring was smashed. So far, however, as the relations of the Gas Company to the city are concerned, they have been entirely satisfactory, and it will be a sorry day for Philadelphia if the city should resume municipal operation of its gas-works. Municipal ownership is one thing, municipal operation another.

"The Times" (London) recently indicated the result of municipal ownership and operation in England, in a series of articles under the title of "Municipal Socialism," from which the following paragraph is quoted:

"Such was the fashion, however, in which the work was done that it was aptly described by one alderman as 'the municipalization of laziness.' There was little or no control over the men, with whom it was essentially a case of 'go as you please.' One or two members of the Council who had been builders went one day to see how a certain work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was progressing, and they found that two men had been for three weeks on a job which one man ought to have finished in three days. In such circumstances as these, the cost of work went up necessarily. The work's manager estimated, for instance, that certain renovations to be carried out in the Stratford Town Hall by his department would cost nine hundred pounds sterling; but, though nothing more was done than he had allowed for, the bill came to two thousand pounds sterling."

It is natural for public officials to try to make a good showing in their accounts in order to justify themselves, and therefore many items which private corporations have to recognize are often omitted. How it works in England is shown by Mr. John Holt Schooling, an eminent authority, in the "Windsor Magazine," for January, 1905. The following is a summary:

Undertaking.	No.	Capital.	Annual Result Claimed.	Correct Result.
Gas	97	£24,030,000	Gain, £394,825	Loss, £1,647,725
Electricity	102	12,510,000	Gain, 11,707	Loss, 1,075,057
Trams	45	9,750,000	Gain, 99,318	Loss, 729,432

The department of Commerce and Labor of the United States Government has issued an interesting report upon the relative expenses of private and municipal electric light and power plants. The year covered is 1902, and the figures as follow:

	Private Stations Per cent.	Municipal Stations Per cent.
Salary and wages	29.9	35.8
Supplies, material and fuel	32.6	46.2
Rent, taxes, insurance and miscellaneous	18.2	8.4
Interest on bonds	19.3	9.6
Total	100	100

Watered Stock.

A principal grievance of the advocates of municipal ownership is that private corporations water their stock, and that this entails an additional burden upon the community. While this may be true in some instances, it is not true as a rule.

The Hon. Chas. G. Dawes, formerly Comptroller of the Currency, well summarizes the facts in the following words:

"Stock in the modern corporation represents, not only ownership, but the location of control. The stockholders of a corporation unanimously desire permanence of control in a certain set of men, in which event they might find it impracticable to have stock issued only in an amount equal to the cash value of its property. The notion that stock is always watered to sell or to perpetrate some fraud is erroneous. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public is not necessarily injured because stock at par does not always represent an equal amount of cash or its equivalent.

"Varying values in corporation assets are reflected in the selling or market value of the stock—not by constant alterations in the stock issues themselves. Dishonest men may, and do to some extent, use watered stock to create impressions of value which does not exist; but the abolishment of watered stock would not materially hinder them. Wrong impressions and overvaluations of stock worth par or above par are created as easily as in the case of watered stock worth less than par, and generally by similar methods. Stock exchanges, through the improper manipulation of operators, are frequently used to create wrong impressions of stock values; but in such cases, and all cases, it is not the water in the stock that causes the chief trouble among unwary investors. It is the water in the prices they pay for it. And that kind of water may be found at times irrigating with remarkable impartiality purchases of stocks at all prices above and below par."

This is emphasized by the Hon. M. A. Knapp, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who, in a paper before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said:

"If common assertion is well founded, the body politic is afflicted with a grievous ailment which takes the name of 'trusts.' Those who diagnose this malady—and nearly every one professes ability to do so—declare that one of its worst and most aggravated symptoms is over-capitalization, or 'watered stock.' For this and other manifestations of the disorder the favorite specific just now is publicity.

"With all deference to those who advocate such publicity as a preventive of stock-watering, I venture to doubt the correctness of their contention. Indeed, my scepticism goes to the extent of questioning whether over-capitalization, as such, is a matter of real gravity, much less a portentous evil which demands an extraordinary remedy. I hold it unproved that the excessive issue of corporate securities is a source of such danger as to excite alarm, and I am yet to be convinced that enforced publicity will not be a harmful exercise of public authority.

"Leaving out the speculator, and taking into account only those seeking honest investment, ten times more money, to say the least, has been sunk in farm mortgages, suburban lots, patent rights, buying and selling grain, cotton and other commodities, where no corporate shares were dealt in or even existed, than was ever lost on account of the fictitious or excessive issue of corporate securities. If the State is to assume the function of keeping folly and cupidity from paying twice or ten times what a thing is worth, it surely would assume the guardianship of the largest numbers and the heaviest losers."

The foregoing applies to the interest of the investor as affected by watered stock. As regards the interest of the consumer of public utilities, the watered railroad carries at the same price as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the unwatered, and the watered gas company sells its product at the same price as the unwatered one. There is a thought in this connection which may not have occurred to everybody, and that is that, even if watered stock is a medium through which promoters do sometimes make profit in one way or another, are they not entitled to a profit? Would our railroads and other public utilities have been built if there had not been a profit to promoters beyond six per cent. upon the actual investment? Some men put their money, labor and time into transportation; some into real estate. Transportation made the real estate valuable. It saved time for the general public and promoted their comfort; yet the men who have grown rich through increased values of real estate are honored, and those who have grown rich through transportation are denounced as "franchise grabbers" and "public robbers." The same is true of lighting, telephone and other corporations. It appears that to grow rich through rendering the public a service is a crime, while to grow rich without such service is honorable. How many of us appreciate that "corporation" means "cooperation" and that the captains of industry, backed by many small partners (stockholders), are doing a great work?

The advocates of municipal ownership and operation claim, first, that it would be a relief from present political corruption; second, that profits would be realized for the public which are now absorbed by corporations. I believe that political corruption under municipal ownership and operation would be infinitely greater than at present, and the expected profits would turn out losses, to be borne by taxpayers. I have stated facts and opinions in support of this belief. I could add many others if space permitted.

There is a large and growing class of citizens who believe in "a square deal" for everybody; that government should protect life, property, health and education, but that in a country with universal suffrage the number of political employees should not be unduly increased; that the line should be drawn between public ownership and public administration, that in a manufacturing or transportation business public administrative waste exceeds corporate profit, and political dangers are greatly enhanced; and that Individualism as distinguished from Socialism should be encouraged.

F. B. THURBER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CRITICISM AND DOGMA.

PROFESSOR CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.LIT.

CRITICISM is a method of knowledge. Wherever there is any sphere of knowledge, Criticism has its place. Criticism is the test of the certainty of knowledge and the method of its verification. It is vain to suppose that Dogma can avoid Criticism any more than any other object of knowledge. If the dogma is true, Criticism will verify it and confirm it. Criticism is destructive only of that which is false. Truth and fact cannot be destroyed. They are imperishable. Criticism and Dogma are not antithetical. They have each their own spheres of activity. Criticism cannot take the place of Dogma, and Dogma cannot take the place of Criticism.

Criticism has several departments in accordance with the several departments of knowledge. These are Philosophical Criticism, Historical Criticism and Scientific Criticism. Each of these has its subdivisions. Biblical Criticism is a section of Historical Criticism, and embraces all kinds of Historical Criticism so far as these may be used within the limits of the Literature of the Bible. There is a great confusion in the public mind at present as regards Criticism and Dogma, because of a failure to discriminate between the different kinds of Criticism and their relation to Dogma. Much has been written upon Higher Criticism in recent years, and yet there is a general misunderstanding as to its meaning, its methods and as to the sphere of its operation. Higher Criticism is essentially Literary Criticism. It is named Higher in distinction from Lower Criticism. Lower Criticism of the Bible has to do with the text of the Bible, to verify and correct it so far as its letters, words, sentences, chapters, books and collections of books are concerned. It has nothing to do with the contents of the writings, except so far as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these may indirectly testify to the text. The Higher Criticism has to do with the higher task of verifying the literary forms of the writings, especially as to the four great problems: integrity, authenticity, literary features and credibility of the writings. These also are purely formal questions and do not concern the contents except indirectly. The contents are tested as to their historicity by Historical Criticism, as to their teachings by the discipline of Biblical Theology. All these varieties of Criticism verify and confirm the contents of the Bible and the forms in which these contents are contained. Any further Criticism goes beyond the realms of Biblical Criticism into the larger sphere of Philosophical Criticism, General Historical Criticism and Scientific Criticism. There are therefore two entirely distinct questions with reference to the relation of Dogma to Criticism: (1) its relation to Biblical Criticism; (2) its relation to other Criticism. After Biblical Criticism has accomplished its task of verification or destruction, then the other departments of Criticism have their work of verification or destruction also. The verification of Biblical Criticism is not sufficient for the final establishment of any dogma. The verification of Philosophical Criticism, General Historical Criticism and Scientific Criticism is necessary for the modern scholar, even if he be convinced that the authority of the Bible is infallible. These distinctions enable us to determine the real state of the question as to the relation between Criticism and Dogma, with regard to any dogma under discussion.

The burning questions of Dogma at present are the Virgin Birth and the bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Most people are greatly confused about them. These two questions are really only two parts of the same fundamental question as to the nature of the body of Christ, which also is at the base of that other important question as to the nature of the presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. The solution of all these problems will probably come together. Christians ought not to be disturbed by the work of Criticism upon any one of them; for such work can only result in the verification and vindication of what is real and true in these dogmas, and the destruction only of what is unreal and false. We shall limit ourselves in this article to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, because this is the one most under discussion at present and the one most difficult of belief

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by a large number of Christian people. The method and principles used in this discussion apply equally well to all other dogmas.

I. *Biblical Criticism and the Virgin Birth.*

(1) The Lower Criticism confirms the dogma of the Virgin Birth. That doctrine is contained in the Gospels of Matthew (I, 18-25) and Luke (I, 26-38). These passages are now and always have been in the texts of these Gospels, and there are no variations in codices or translations that in any particular impair their statements as to the Virgin Birth.

(2) The Higher Criticism also confirms the dogma. It is true that the dogma is not contained in the Gospel of Mark; but that Gospel begins the story of Jesus with His Baptism, and only briefly reports the ministry of John the Baptist prior to it. The author of this Gospel, however, represents Jesus as the Son of God, the Lord God of Isaiah XL, 3, heralded by John, the messenger of that prophecy. It did not come within the scope of the plan of this evangelist to state how the divine Son of God entered the world. The Gospel of John does not contain the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. It tells of the entrance of the divine Word into the world by incarnation. It is absorbed in the nature of the Incarnation and does not give attention to its mode of birth. The silence of these Gospels cannot, therefore, be used as an argument against the doctrine. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke, instead of stating the high doctrine of the Divinity of Christ and the Incarnation of the Eternal Logos, limit themselves to the Virgin Birth of Jesus, which is certainly a simpler doctrine according to ancient conceptions. It is said by some that Jesus is represented in the Gospels as the son of Joseph (John I, 45), and therefore could not have been virgin-born. But no such implication is in this statement. When Joseph took Mary to wife and recognized Jesus, the son of Mary, as his son (Matthew I, 24-25), Jesus certainly became the son of Joseph in legal and common uses of the term.

It used to be said by the older objectors to the Virgin Birth, and is still said by some at the present time, that the narratives of the infancy of Jesus were later additions to the Gospels; but this opinion has been destroyed by a deeper study, which shows that the Gospels of Matthew and Luke both depend upon earlier sources. They both used a writing of St. Matthew, the apostle,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known as the *Logia,* and a Gospel of Mark in a simpler form than the present Gospel. The story of the infancy of Jesus came from a third earlier source, the Gospel of Luke using more of it than the Gospel of Matthew. This earlier source was poetical in form. It may have been one or more poems. That question has not been finally settled. But it is evident that these Gospels simply give prose settings to this poetry. Matthew gives but one poetic extract, but Luke several in those canticles which have always been used in the worship of the Church. These snatches of poetry were evidently written originally in Hebrew and have all the features of Hebrew poetry, parallelism, lines measured by tonic beats, and strophical organization. They were translated into Greek by the authors of the Gospels. The work of the evangelists upon them was limited to translation and prose settings. The documentary authority is, therefore, in original anonymous sources, endorsed by the two independent Gospels that used them, Luke and Matthew.

These poetic extracts which give the doctrine of the Virgin Birth are early in their origin, among the earliest of the documents upon which the New Testament depends. They must have originated in the Palestinian community before the dispersion of the Christians prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, thus during the lifetime of James and Jude, the half-brothers of Christ, and on that account credible to as high a degree as any other document of the New Testament.

The piece cited by Matthew (I, 20-21) is:

"Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife:
For that which is begotten in her is of the Holy Spirit.
And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus;
For it is he that shall save his people from their sins."

The piece cited by Luke (I, 35-37) is:

"The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee,
And the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee:
Wherefore also that holy thing that is to be born
Shall be called the Son of God."

The doctrine of the conception by the Holy Spirit and the birth from the Virgin is in a poetic form, but the substance of the doctrine is unmistakable. The form in which it is stated is in accordance with the ideas of the Jewish Christian community

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the time. The conception by the Spirit takes place in connection with a theophany. The description is in terms of theophany and in Hebraistic style. All this favors its credibility. Thus all the lines of the Higher Criticism favor the Virgin Birth.

(3) What has Historical Criticism to say about this dogma? Here we must distinguish between Biblical Historical Criticism and General Historical Criticism. The questions that may be raised are:

(*a*) The Genesis of the story. We have seen that its literary origin was in a poetic source, composed in the Palestinian community prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. It must have had the sanction of James and Jude of the family of Jesus, the heads of the Palestinian Church, otherwise it could not have been tolerated in the Christian community and could not have been regarded as authoritative by the authors of the Gospels. All these were too near the birth of Jesus, in temporal, geographical and personal relations, to go astray in so important a matter. The two pieces of poetry are entirely consistent, though in poems of different measure and in different language. In the one, the child is to be called Jesus; in the other, the Son of God. In the one, that which is begotten is of the Holy Spirit; in the other, the Holy Spirit comes upon the Virgin with the power of the Most High, and the result is a holy thing to be born. The conception by the Holy Spirit and birth from the Virgin are evident in both. The poems are put in the mouths of angels addressing Joseph and Mary themselves. The poems certainly do not give the exact words of these angels; but only the substance of their communication. This substance was either a conception of the poet, or was derived directly, or indirectly, from Joseph and Mary. But, in any case, the poet makes angels as well as Joseph and Mary witnesses to the reality of the Virgin Birth. It is difficult to see how any writer could have gone any nearer the sources for his material or have produced more reliable witnesses.

(*b*) The next question is as to the genuineness of the story. We may dismiss at once the suggestion of the older uncritical Deists and Rationalists, that it was meant to deceive as a forgery of lies. The only questions debatable are, whether it was a myth, legend, fiction or historical fact. There is a place in the Bible for all of these. They all have their use and purpose in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religious instruction. There are many legends and myths as to the childhood of Jesus in later Gospels of the Infancy. May the poetical story of the Virgin Birth be one of the earliest of these? Many of the older critics so supposed. But we cannot think of myth or legend, because these poems that contain the statements as to the Virgin Birth are too near the event, too close to the apostolic community, too near the family of Jesus, too near the Virgin herself, to admit of the growth of such a legend or myth, and of its acceptance by the family of our Lord and by the early Christian community. The only question that is debatable is whether the Virgin Birth rests upon the testimony of Joseph and Mary directly, or indirectly through the children of Joseph, James and Jude, or whether it originated in the family of Jesus after the death of Joseph and Mary as a pious conception, to explain the Incarnation to those who had come to the opinion that He was divine and preexistent before His birth into the world. This is a question we have no means of answering.

(*c*) We must now confront the question of the reliability of the story of the Virgin Birth. If it rests upon the testimony of Joseph and Mary, they were the only primary human witnesses possible, and the very best witnesses. How could either Joseph or Mary be mistaken as to this matter? We must accept their testimony, or reject them as false witnesses. But, to reject their testimony, would be to impeach them so seriously that it disproves itself, because inconsistent with their character as attested by their own lives and that of Jesus, James and Jude, and the unquestioned esteem for them in the Apostolic Church. They might not be able to explain the fact of the Virgin Birth, they might have mistaken their own subjective illusions for angelic voices, but they must have known whether the Virgin Birth was a reality or not. If now we take the other alternative and suppose that the Virgin Birth is a poet's conception as to the mode of the Incarnation, originating from a pious opinion rather than from testimony, then we must admit that it rests upon the opinion of those best qualified to interpret the mode of the Incarnation, not only because they were nearest to the person and life of our Lord, knowing Him from birth until death, but also because they were guided by the divine Spirit to interpret and teach the doctrine of Jesus to their fellow men. If we accept the promises of Jesus as valid, and the preaching of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apostles, the founders of Christianity, as reliable, we must accept their testimony even as to so extraordinary and unexampled an event.

(4) What then has Biblical Theology to say upon this question? The Virgin Birth is essentially a doctrine or dogma. It is a mode of birth in Incarnation, and indeed the only mode known to the New Testament or Christian Theology. It is quite true that, in all the many references to the Incarnation in the Epistles and the Gospel of St. John, there is no mention of the Virgin Birth, and nothing that involves it; and it is quite possible that St. Paul, when writing his Epistles, never thought of it. That, however, amounts to nothing more than this, that St. Paul was so deeply concerned with the preexistence of Christ, with His divinity, and with the saving purpose of the Incarnation that he did not concern himself with the mode of birth; or, if he did know the mode, did not regard that as important to the purposes he had in mind in writing his Epistles. The same may be said of the author of the writings attributed to St. John. On the other hand, there is no other mode of birth in Incarnation stated or suggested in any of the numerous references to the Incarnation in the New Testament; and nothing that is in any way inconsistent with the mode of Incarnation by Virgin Birth. If Jesus Christ is the incarnation of a preexisting divine person, then some mode of birth was necessary. There seems to be no alternative between the Virgin Birth and birth in the ordinary way of human generation. It is altogether improbable that any one in the first Christian century could have thought of the Incarnation in any other way than by Virgin Birth. Other religions remote from Christianity do not hesitate to attribute virgin birth to their founders. It was the common opinion in Biblical times that barren women may conceive by the power of God in answer to prayer. Nothing is more common in all the religions of the world than for women to pray to their gods that they may conceive, and to regard conception as an answer to their prayers. It would be difficult to show that any one in the time of Jesus would have thought it possible that God could be born of a woman by the ordinary method of human generation. If any one really thought of the mode of Incarnation, the only mode thinkable in the first Christian century was Virgin Birth. Ob-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jections to Virgin Birth in the interest of natural generation are very modern, due almost entirely to the exaggerations of modern Physical Science. The environment of thought in the apostolic age verifies the conception of the Virgin Birth.

Thus all the departments of Biblical Criticism, Textual Criticism, Higher Criticism, Historical Criticism and Biblical Theology verify and confirm the Virgin Birth as a dogmatic fact. Whoever accepts the authority of the Bible as final is compelled to accept the Virgin Birth as an Article of his Faith. There can be no question but that the authority of the Church was given to the Virgin Birth in the old Roman Creed not later than the middle of the second century, and that it has been an official article of all the great branches of the Christian Church until the present day. Whoever accepts the authority of the Church as final is obliged to accept the Virgin Birth as an Article of his Faith.

II. *Other Criticism and the Virgin Birth.*

The modern mind is not content to accept any dogma on the testimony of the Bible, or on the testimony of the Church, or on the testimony of both combined. Every event and every dogma must be subjected to the test of general Historical Criticism, to Philosophy and to Science, and must submit to their verification or condemnation. Even the Christian who submits to the authority of the Bible and Church must submit his dogma to these tests of Criticism, if he would use it to convince and convert other men. He is the last one who should object to such tests. He should have such confidence in the authority to which he submits as to have no doubt of its verification in all matters and in all respects.

(1) General Historical Criticism does not recognize the authority of Bible and Church as final. It challenges the evidence itself. The testimony of an ancient document, however venerable and credible, is not altogether sufficient. It is necessary to consider whether the Virgin Birth is in accordance with the experience of mankind and therefore natural; or contrary to that experience and therefore unnatural or supernatural. It is admitted that the Virgin Birth is not in accord with the experience of mankind. It is contrary to human experience. It belongs to the realm of the supernatural. The Virgin Birth of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroes of all other religions is denied without hesitation by devout Christian scholars. Why, then, should the Virgin Birth of the Founder of Christianity be the only exception in the history of the world? The historic origin of Christianity may seem to justify the Virgin Birth, so far as the Gospels and the opinion of the Apostolic Church are concerned; but the historian is obliged to consider the environment of Christianity, the circumstances under which it arose, and the history of the great World of which Christianity is only a part; and of other religions, whose history has in many respects gone through the same historical process as Christianity itself. Such an event, if it be an event, lies outside the limits of historical Criticism, just as truly as do angels and all the phenomena of the spiritual and invisible world. History can take account of Jesus only so far as His life in this world is concerned.

But if Historical Criticism, on the one hand, is impotent to verify the Virgin Birth as a fact, on the other hand it is impotent to discredit the doctrine. If angels exist, if there is a spiritual world, if there are spiritual relations between mankind and that spiritual world, if an incarnation of a preexisting divine person was necessary to human salvation; even if unique and unexampled in History, the Virgin Birth may be beyond the domain of Historical Criticism, but it is not impossible in itself; and if angels exist as ministering spirits they may have made the annunciation to Joseph and Mary. General History, if it cannot verify the fact of the Virgin Birth, verifies the dogma as appearing in the most primitive Christian Creed, not later than the middle of the second century, as the unanimous consensus of the Christian Church in all its great historical organizations until the present time, as a dogma which has determined the history of Christian doctrine, and through Christian doctrine the Christian Church and Christian civilization for nineteen centuries. It is not possible to explain the history of the world without recognizing that there is a God in History, and that, to use the words of Lessing, "The History of the world is the divine education of the race." It is not possible to explain Christian History without the recognition of Christ in History, and if Christ, then what Christianity has always recognized Christ to be, the Incarnate Saviour, who by Virgin Birth identified Himself, once for all and forever, not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with an individual man, but with human nature, as the Head of redeemed humanity. These things are dogmas interpreting History, which cannot be verified by Historical Criticism as realities attested by the human senses and human experience; but, without them, Christian History is unintelligible, inexplicable, a mass of heterogeneous facts and events without harmony and without unity.

(2) Modern Physical Science cannot verify the Virgin Birth of our Lord, because such an event is contrary to the general law of human births. Science, thus far, knows of no exception and is unable to see how such an exception is within the realm of possibility with normal human beings. If our Lord entered this world by the Virgin Birth, it must have been in an abnormal way at present unverifiable by Science. Therefore, such a birth must be regarded as outside the limits of scientific investigation. Science in its development fortifies more and more the uniformity and immutability of the laws of nature. The laws of nature are the laws of God. Moderns shrink from thinking that God would violate His own laws even in the incarnation of the divine Son.

On the other hand, Science cannot say that the Virgin Birth of our Lord is impossible, because it may be a unique fact, justified by such a unique purpose as the Incarnation of the Son of God in order to the redemption of mankind. Science can only say that it is beyond the realm of Science and that it is in the realm of Dogma; and that the dogma must not be stated in any form that will contravene the laws of nature. Physical Science, notwithstanding its great achievements in recent years, is as truly enveloped in mysteries as is Christian Dogma. New discoveries are constantly verifying, or destroying, old theories. Physical Science is now face to face with a world beyond the reach of the human senses. It has been so shaken by recent investigations that it requires all its energies to reconstruct its own doctrines. It is at present in too unstable a position to give the law to Theology. Many things are now done every day, in accordance with laws now known, which in ancient times would have been regarded as miracles. Doubtless, there are other laws yet to be discovered of which Science knows nothing. If there is a God, Who governs all nature by law, He may use laws as yet unknown to accomplish His purposes. And who can say that there may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be crises in the history of the world when the Creator and Governor of the Universe may act Himself directly, without the use of any law whatever. The Incarnation of the Son of God was from its very nature a unique event, the most unique that any one could conceive of. In this event, if in any, God might act directly in theophany, as the Gospels represent Him as acting. Unless we are prepared to exclude God from His Universe and deny to Him any immediate action in its interests, we must recognize that the Incarnation was an event in which He would act directly, if ever, for it is God Himself becoming man. This again is Dogma, back of Physical Science; but in no respects antagonistic with Scientific Criticism or inconsistent therewith. It is in a realm into which Physical Science cannot as yet enter and may never be able to enter.

(3) So far as I can see, Modern Philosophy has nothing against the Virgin Birth as such, unless it can be shown that such a birth impairs the nature of the man that is born, or his human descent, or his unity with the human race as such, or disturbs the order of the Universe. When, however, the Virgin Birth is considered in its consequences in connection with the doctrine of the human nature of Christ, Philosophy has much to say. In the dogma of the Incarnation, the preexisting Son of God became man. It is necessary, therefore, to consider the relation of the divine and human natures in the God-man. In the evolution of the doctrine of the Incarnation in early Christian Theology, it was made evident that the union of the preexistent Son of God with humanity could not have taken place at any time after birth, whether at the baptism, the presentation in the temple, the birth itself, or at any other conceivable time. It must have been before birth and in the conception itself. It was also made evident that Jesus Christ must have been a complete and normal man, body and soul, His soul possessed of all its faculties, mind, affections and will.

The only thing in which His human nature differed from that of other men was in its union with the divine nature and the unity of the two natures in one person. Such a union of natures and such a unity in one person were unique and beyond the sphere of human knowledge or experience. The unity of the body and soul of a man is in the personality of the individual. Jesus was not only man, with body and soul, but also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before He became man He was a divine person with a divine nature. The divine person of the Son of God became man and, therefore, the divine personality became the unity of divinity and humanity in the God-man. The Son of God could not divest Himself of divine personality and become an individual man with a human personality. Being and remaining God, He must have remained a divine personality. He could not have assumed human personality with human nature without becoming two distinct beings, God and man, without becoming two and not one. In ancient as well as in modern times difficulty has been felt with regard to the absence of human personality from the man Christ Jesus. It seems to make his humanity incomplete. This difficulty was overcome by the doctrine that the human nature of Christ received its personality by union with the person of the Logos. What had to be excluded was that the human nature received its personality from its humanity. There could not be a duality of personalities in the God-man without making the union a merely objective one, chiefly if not entirely ethical. All this raises many difficult questions for Psychology and metaphysical and cosmic Philosophy, but none that have ever been regarded as insuperable by theologians, none that were not removed by the dogmatic statements of theologians more than a thousand years ago, when these questions were more hotly debated than at the present time. These doctrines were formed with a full use of the greatest systems of Philosophy that have ever appeared, the Platonic and the Aristotelian, and have maintained themselves through all the centuries to the present time. It is extremely improbable that they can be unsettled by that medley of heterogeneous and conflicting opinions that constitutes the Philosophy of our day. Philosophy is at present the most unsettled and unstable of all departments of human knowledge. It is in no position to give the law to a dogma which has Plato and Aristotle at its back.

The Philosophical difficulties which beset the doctrine of the Virgin Birth do not concern the Virgin Birth in particular, but the Incarnation in general. Indeed, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth seems to be the only way of overcoming the chief difficulties. If the preexistent Son of God became incarnate by ordinary generation, we could not escape the conclusion that a human individual person was begotten. The In-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carnation would then not be a real Incarnation, but an inhabitation of Jesus by the Son of God, with two distinct personalities, that of the preexistent Son of God and that of the begotten son of Joseph. Nestorianism could not be avoided. Such a merely external union of the divine Son with a human individual could not accomplish human salvation, as the Christian Church has always clearly seen. If the Son of God only inhabited the man Jesus, He might save that man, but how could He accomplish the salvation of the human race? Such an inhabitation of the Son of God would not differ in principle from the indwelling of the divine Spirit in a man. The man Jesus would be a prophet, a hero, a great exemplar, but not the Saviour of mankind. He might be the last and greatest of the heroes of Faith, but not God Incarnate. Only a God-man who had taken human nature into organic unio with Himself and so identified Himself with the human race as to become the common man, the second Adam, the head of the race, could redeem the race. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth gives such a God-man. Natural generation could not possibly give us such a God-man. Therefore, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is essential to the integrity of the Incarnation, as the Incarnation is to the doctrine of Christ and Christian Salvation.

When it is said that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is essential, it is meant that it is essential to the system of doctrine and the Faith of the Christian Church. The Church can no more dispense with that doctrine than it can dispense with the Incarnation or Christ Himself. It is not, however, essential to the faith or Christian life of individuals. The doctrine may for various reasons be so difficult to them that they cannot honestly accept it. They may content themselves with the doctrine of the Incarnation and refuse to accept any doctrine as to its mode. They may even go so far as to deny the Virgin Birth, and hold to the theory of ordinary generation without accepting the legitimate consequences of that doctrine. Theologians are not always consequential. Men are responsible for what they believe and teach, not for what others think that they ought logically to believe and teach. The Church may, and in the present situation and circumstances of Christian Theology ought to, tolerate opinions which it cannot endorse.

Christian dogma is in a process of reconstruction, owing to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the partial adoption by theologians of the principle of development. Science and Philosophy are also in a condition of reconstruction and restatement. Confusion of thought is inevitable under these circumstances. The Church, the most stable of all human institutions, can afford to be patient and charitable, and to wait until its scholars have removed the difficulties that in this age envelop Christian Dogma. These can only be overcome in the arena of chivalric scholarship, not in ecclesiastical courts ruled by ecclesiastics, who are usually more concerned about the forms of things than about their reality. Christian scholars as a body are not at all dubious as to the Virgin Birth. It is not at all a question of Biblical Criticism, but of Christian Dogma. They are generously inclined towards those who at present are either doubtful about it, or even disposed to deny it. Biblical and historical scholars are just as decided in its maintenance as dogmatic theologians. For it is a dogma which is inextricably involved in the Christological principle that lies at the basis of Christian Dogma and Christian Institutions. They cannot possibly recognize that the birth of Christ was by ordinary human generation, for that would be a revival of the Nestorian heresy and be a denial of all the Christian Philosophy of the centuries, with all the serious consequences therein involved. It would turn back the dial of Christianity nearly two thousand years; it would break with Historical Christianity and its apostolic foundation, and imperil Christianity itself.

C. A. Briggs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PLEA FOR STEAMMANSHIP IN THE NAVY.

BY REAR-ADMIRAL S. EARDLEY-WILMOT, R. N.

In the January number of this Review, Admiral Luce puts forward a plea for an Engineer Corps in the Navy—that is to say, a body of officers distinct from those who rise to command ships and fleets. I believe that such a policy would be a retrograde step.

I admit there is something at first sight apparently attractive in the argument which urges the impossibility of making an officer a jack-of-all-trades and hence master of none. There must be specialists in the higher branches of naval science; but, when a person speaks of knowledge of marine machinery and the direction of ships or fleets as pertaining to two distinct professions, I at once join issue with him. That they were considered so in the past led to all the difficulties which we are endeavoring to remove. To realize this, it is necessary to recount briefly how this came about, at any rate as regards the British Navy.

At the outset, let me disclaim that definition of a seaman which limits him to a knowledge of handling and navigating a ship under sail. What has always differentiated the landsman from the seaman is that the one can move, or cause to be moved, a craft on the water, and the other cannot, whether that craft be a coracle, canoe, rowboat or sailing-vessel. The seaman could handle or put in motion, in each case, the power which propelled the craft. The landsman was equally at fault whether with paddle, oar or sail. When steam-power replaced sail-power as the propelling agency, why did it not follow the same law?—for we have seamen to-day who know little more of the machinery which moves their vessel than a landsman. We will trace the cause.

Before the Norman Conquest of the British Islands we had proficient seamen on the coast engaged in trade and the fisheries, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not trained to arms. The best sailors were on the south coast, and their craft were organized as the fleets of the Cinque Ports. When a fighting-force was required at sea, the vessels underwent some modifications, and soldiers embarked with the weapons of that day. As soon as the time of combat arrived, the mariners placed the vessel where the men-at-arms could ply their weapons or board the foe. The custom of having separate forces for navigating and fighting at sea continued for many years after the introduction of cannon and large-masted ships. Then its great inconvenience became more apparent. If in action considerable casualties occurred to the men working the guns, they could not be reinforced from the mariners; while, if the sailors suffered heavily, the soldiers could not be used for manipulating the sails as required. The soldiers were landsmen. Hence one force proficient in both duties became necessary, and the working of the guns fell to the sailors, a certain number of soldiers being retained for musketry—a custom which still prevails in a modified form with the Royal Marines. We also used soldiers to complete crews of ships when sufficient seamen could not be obtained.

We find, then, practically one corps propelling the ship and working its weapons during the old wars which terminated in 1815. The naval officer took great pride in handling his ship under sail. He knew all about the art, having assimilated it in infancy. He had graduated in the various branches of equipment, maintenance and repair, so there was nothing about the propelling power of his ship he did not know. He could tell from personal knowledge if a sail required shifting, a yard repairing or a rope renewing. Familiarity with theory and practice went together to make him a master in the art of seamanship. Of course, some officers attained great superiority over others in these respects; but the general standard was high, because in this portion of a naval officer's calling specialization did not exist: the propelling power was common to all. A lieutenant could splice a rope, turn in a dead-eye, or handle palm and needle as well as the most skilful sailor or boatswain.

Such was the position of affairs when, about 1820, steam-power knocked at the door of our picturesque war-ships. It gained a tardy admittance, but pride and prejudice denied it the parlor and relegated it to the kitchen. Our officers as a body would have nothing to do with the newcomer. It tarnished the spot-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less decks, spoilt the trim for sailing, and was to those conservative old salts an unseamanlike method of propulsion. Though unable to prevent its advent, they could impede the development of steam, which made slow progress. First came the paddle-wheel, then the screw-propeller. A few men divined what the future held, and recognized the advantages of a power independent of the wind, as when Charles Napier had paddle-wheels fitted to his sailing-frigate and worked them by winches, but distinguished admirals shook their heads when Ericsson gave a demonstration on the Thames of a boat propelled by steam and a screw. They feared it would impair steering efficiency. However, there was no resisting the importunity of steam; and, when it definitely arrived, the Navy entered a corps of engineers and stokers specially for this duty. At the time no alternative existed, for we had not thought of grafting a steam course on to the training of seamen so as to fit them for handling the new power. Nor could such foresight, perhaps, have been expected; for, between 1820 and 1860, the number of engineers and stokers in the complement of a war-ship was comparatively small. Machinery did no more than propel the ship; we had no steam-boats, and even the anchor came up by manual labor.

Though we thus infringed the principle of having only one class for propelling and fighting—for the newcomers were not taught gunnery or navigation—in the limitation of the numbers and the duties of the special corps, we escaped the difficulties which later on beset us. We must remember that even the ablest officers viewed steam only as an auxiliary to sail. As an indication of the estimate in which the Navy held steam it may be mentioned that engineer officers when first entered held only warrant rank. Steam war-ships of all classes carried a full equipment of masts and sails, and resorted to steam only when it was absolutely necessary to do so. During a three years' commission in the Pacific on board one of our early ironclads, we traversed 51,000 miles of water, out of which 34,000 miles were accomplished under sail. Looking back, one is lost in admiration —though the feeling is mingled with regret for misdirected effort—at the enthusiasm and perseverance with which officers pursued the impossible task of making a craft almost devoid of sailing capacity emulate the "Saucy Arethusa" of bygone days.

This worship of a cult no longer of primary importance to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fighting-ship diverted attention for a time from a pressing need. We may even admit some justice in the contention that a seaman of the period when sail and steam struggled for mastery could hardly become an expert in both, and hence that there might have been then a necessity for two classes; but when clear proof arrived that the retention of sail-power served no good purpose, besides crippling the fighting capacity of modern warships, we should at once have taken steps to modify naval training with another end in view. Instead of which we continued to instruct seamen fully in all the paraphernalia of a dying art, and at the same time to increase the numbers of those specially trained in machinery but not trained to weapons or in navigation. For now the new power began to absorb every operation in ordinary routine afloat. Steam brought the anchor to the bows, hoisted in boats, steered the ship, trained the guns, but in all of this the so-called seaman played almost the part of a spectator only. Naturally, the corps which possessed the knowledge of these things increased in importance as well as in numbers, and gradually acquired a power which led to extensive modifications in its status.

The fact of having a separate body of officers for this all-important duty, combined with traditional prejudice, kept the general mass of combatant officers from acquiring any intimate knowledge of steam-machinery. Proficiency in this branch did not influence advancement or employment; ignorance did not retard promotion. Forty years ago, young officers qualifying for the rank of lieutenant were examined in Seamanship, Gunnery and Navigation; the Seamanship questions comprising all the art of the ancient mariner. I remember my own experience, and the delight of my examiners at being told correctly how to clubhaul off a lee shore under sail; but it never entered their heads to question me as to the type of engines fitted in my ship. Later, Torpedo and Pilotage were added to the subjects for this examination; but earlier promotion, which rewards exceptional attainment in all these, is independent of intimate acquaintance with the power which propels the ship. Can we wonder, then, at the view held by many—erroneous, as I think it—that to become an expert in steam requires the sole attention of a lifetime; that an officer unaccustomed to the subject and looking into a modern engine-room should see there too vast a subject to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

added to his existing burden of professional knowledge? But is not this a matter of age and early training? I remember, as a midshipman in a full-rigged ship, landsmen looking aloft at the innumerable ropes leading in every direction, and exclaiming: "Do you mean to say you know the names of all the ropes and what they do? I should think it would take a lifetime to learn that!" Why did it appear a simple matter to the youngster of that day? Because he had been associated with ropes and the then seaman's stock in trade almost from infancy. Assimilation in early life is the answer to those who see such mystery in the engine-room. The first twenty years of my naval career were spent in full-rigged steamships, and this experience led me to form the opinion that it was more difficult to acquire proficiency in sail propulsion than in steam propulsion, and that more science was involved in the former. The perfect seaman of old required such a knowledge of weather as could only come from years of experience, and a constant study of atmospheric conditions enabled him to conquer the elements when most adverse. The power conferred by steam gives an independence of movement which obviates the need of such close study of wind and sky.

I believe most officers whose service includes this transition period will agree with the foregoing; but, under any circumstances, I maintain that a thorough knowledge of ship propulsion must be attained by all officers as the first attribute of a seaman to-day. For the position of affairs when we instituted the new course of naval training was as follows: We had a large body of officers versed in all the mechanical appliances which gave the vessel life as well as movement, but not trained to gunnery or command; while another body directed the vessel, without any considerable acquaintance with the motive power. The rivalry between these two corps formed the least evil of this dual system. Want of interchangeability might have serious results in an action. Assume the engine-room to be immune, by its position, from serious injury by shot or shell, but suppose it has suffered heavy casualties from some accident below; if all have been trained in propulsion, it can be reinforced from the deck in such a case without difficulty. Take the converse. Working guns with diminished crews has always formed part of ordnance drill. Gun-fire is slackening owing to the well-directed projectiles of the enemy. The guns want reinforcing, and the engine-room

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can spare one or two officers with a party of men for that purpose. What a source of strength if, in either case, each set of persons can at once drop into familiar duties; for I advocate that men as well as officers be trained on the same lines. But the main point is that the man in command, in order to handle his craft to the best advantage in peace or war, must have a complete grasp of all the machinery which converts her from an inert mass into an organism replete with life. This is only achieved by early and constant familiarity. I think most officers in command have felt, at some time or another, their need for more knowledge in this respect. It was often so in my own case, involving something approaching to a feeling of humiliation that a subordinate possessed knowledge that I lacked; a condition that did not apply as to guns, torpedoes, etc. Such will always be the case when there is a separate and distinct class for the performance of any particular duty; the tendency will be to lower the standard of knowledge regarding that duty among the mass of individuals.

A striking example of this is furnished by the system—formerly prevailing in the British Navy—of having a separate and distinct corps of officers for navigation who did not rise to command ships of war. Although navigating a vessel is one of the primary attributes of a seaman's calling, it was made the specialty of a class, with the result of diminishing the interest felt by other grades in this work. To the proposal to abolish the system many opposed urgent objections somewhat similar to what we hear now about the machinery. Our ships would be badly navigated; we must expect an increase of grounding; it required a man to devote his whole life to this branch, and so on. Nevertheless, the change was made; and I have heard two successive hydrographers affirm that the navigation of our fleet is as good as, if not better than, it was under the old régime, while the general knowledge of this subject among all officers has much improved.

I do not agree with Admiral Luce in his advocacy of specialization if carried to the extent of separation into classes. A certain number of specialists are necessary for the higher branches of naval science; but natural bent and other influences will meet the demand without creating distinct classification at the outset. A high general standard is most essential, and it is best attained by keeping specialization within the narrowest limits.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I must confess that the views here set forth do not command universal consent with my brother officers, especially among the most senior. In discussing the question with them, they frequently cite the United States Navy as an instance where the attempt to make deck officers interchangeable with the engine-room staff has—they say—failed. I am not aware whether this is the case or not; but, if any want of success has resulted, I should attribute it to the fact that the change has not been sufficiently gradual in its operation. I remember reading the memorandum of the Assistant Secretary which introduced or preceded the Personnel Act, and it seemed to me that the reasons given for the policy advocated were absolutely unassailable. The method of application may have impaired success. For such a great change as the amalgamation of two classes whose duties had hitherto been distinct, gradual preparation is necessary. To direct an instant alternation of duties would not suffice where one set of duties was viewed with disfavor by many affected. A prejudice fostered by tradition existed against engineering duties in the Navy, so that, while those hitherto employed below went willingly on deck, there was not the same alacrity on the part of the deck officers to take their turn in the engine-room. At least so I gathered from a report of the Engineer-in-Chief of the United States Navy, accompanying Estimates of the Bureau of Engineering for the fiscal year ending 1903.

Though following the lead thus given by the United States, the British Admiralty are applying the principle by more gradual steps. The naval officer, at the earliest moment of his career, has impressed on him the importance of engineering work, and at once begins his training in it. No prejudice against this branch has entered his mind. In most cases, a desire to handle tools and machines exists at the age—12 to 13—when he thus begins to master the elements of mechanical appliances. A well-found workship gives him that early familiarity with machines which his predecessor had with masts and sails. Hardly emerged from childhood, he thus begins to assimilate modern seamanship; and, in a year or two, cylinders, pistons, turbines, etc., will present no more difficulty as a form of knowledge than the paraphernalia of sails and ropes did to the "Skilful Urchin" of old.

Other critics, though recognizing the benefits that will accrue from giving the executive officer a more extensive knowledge of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steam, are afraid he will lose the faculty of command, while we shall only obtain amateur engineers. In neither case do I share this gloomy view. An equal distribution of time on deck and at the machinery for the young officer at sea will give him ample opportunity for practical acquaintance with both duties. A midshipman's work on the quarterdeck of a modern war-ship does not involve many or varied services. There seems no reason why a daily turn of duty in the engine-room should incapacitate a lieutenant from efficient control on the bridge.

Why, again, should we not obtain good engineers under a system which gives them several years' continuous instruction in this branch at the most receptive age? We cannot expect that all will achieve preeminence; but, as with gunnery, torpedo surveying, etc., we shall secure a sufficient number with a special aptitude for the work to execute the higher functions appertaining to marine engineering.

It is said, and Admiral Luce dwells on the point, that the Mercantile Marine have not adopted, and will not adopt, any such system. That is quite possible, as the two services have a different end in view. The Navy exists mainly for use in war. Its organization is based on that eventuality, and the crews of vessels composing the fleet must be trained to that end. I have indicated how fighting capacity is augmented by departing from the dual and specialized distribution of the crew. This consideration does not apply to the Mercantile Marine, which may therefore prefer to retain things as they are. A few years ago we were told that it would not adopt water-tube boilers or turbine engines, as the advantages in each case were supposed to be discernible only from a fighting point of view; but, apparently, the commercial prejudice against this machinery is disappearing. In the same way I cannot help believing that the Mercantile Marine will eventually adopt the naval system of training for the advantages it possesses apart from the question of combat.

A further objection advanced is that the naval officer, once he takes up engineering as a special line, must remain there and lose his chance to command a fleet. This does not follow, and is not experienced by gunnery, torpedo and navigating officers. A lieutenant allocated to engineering duties—that is, to the charge of machinery, in the sense in which ordnance and gunnery practice is under the supervision of the gunnery officer—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will receive promotion in due course, and may or may not continue in the same path. There will be good scope if inclination and aptitude retain him for the higher branches of marine engineering.

Finally, the British Navy has the best chance of success for the policy it has adopted because of the early age at which it enlists its executive officers. As long as I can remember, the age for entry and the training to follow have not only formed subjects for argument afloat and ashore, but have also engaged the attention of many committees appointed to report on the subject. The conclusions of these differed in nearly every instance, as they viewed the requirements for a naval officer from different standpoints. One wanted greater scholastic attainments, another more practical experience. Through good repute and bad repute, our naval authorities have maintained the principle of early entry for a sea life, with, I believe, on the whole, good results. We may be, and probably are, inferior in scholastic knowledge to those officers whose school teaching is continued to a later age. Our acquaintance with foreign languages is not equal to that of the German naval officer, for instance. But, after all, the primary object in the training of a naval officer is that he may handle his ship efficiently under all circumstances in peace, and prevail in war. We are content, therefore, to sacrifice some of the graces to secure that early practical acquaintance with sea conditions and responsibility to which we attach greater importance. As the Admiralty Memorandum introducing our new system eloquently puts it:

> "Notwithstanding the fact that, during the transition period, the system of naval education has been the subject of much criticism, the character of the naval officer has remained unimpaired, and character is of more value than knowledge. Now, however, as always, the highest type of naval officer is that wherein great professional knowledge is added to force of character."

It was because great professional knowledge of perhaps the most important portion of a sea career was not attained under the old system; because that system, from lack of the unity which can only be secured by a common entry and method of training, led to conflicting interests detrimental to the service; and because of the weakness attached to maintaining two forces not readily inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changeable when occasion demanded, that we introduced the great change now in operation. Of its success, if loyally accepted, and not impeded by prejudice, foreboding and lukewarm adherence, I have no doubt. I will go further and predict that, given the support we have a right to expect for a step taken to remove an undesirable state of affairs, we shall in ten years' time only wonder that it had not been taken at an earlier period.

Since writing the foregoing, I have read the article, "Our Navy," by "An American Citizen," in the March issue of this REVIEW, supporting the views of Admiral Luce. As we are told that he is, from close observation, familiar with the conditions which prevail in the naval service of the United States, I desire to add a few comments upon that portion of his article which deals with the specialization of functions on board ships of war.

In the first place, I do not contest the right of any layman to express an opinion upon a subject which requires for its mastery, not only familiarity with the conditions of naval service, but also practical experience of the service itself. Continued observation and discussion with those qualified by experience to instruct will allow of an opinion being formed which may or may not be sound; and the opinion expressed in this case appears to me unsound. Three functions are mentioned as necessary to the efficiency of a war-ship, and these are stated to be separated by broad lines of demarcation. These are the sailor to command, the engineer to propel and the gunner for the weapons. Certain attributes are considered essential for the man in command. Though he must know all about manœuvring ships and bringing them into action, he need not be master of the details of that machinery which enables his ship to come into action.

I have already endeavored to show why such knowledge is necessary, but the reasoning by which the opposite view is here sustained needs refutation. It is based on the fact that the propelling power is now out of sight, whereas formerly the sails were always in view of the officer on deck. Hence, the commander to-day need only know the effect and not the cause of the power he wields. Surely such a view is erroneous and loses sight of much that is requisite to qualify a man to command a modern battle-ship. The skilful sailor of old did not require to have the sails in sight to know whether they were exercising a correct effect. A thorough seaman could tell from his bed if his ship

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not being sailed properly, and give the remedy to an inexperienced officer of the watch. I have been with captains who never came on deck at night, but who, nevertheless, knew at once if sails were not properly trimmed. What made men pre-eminent as seamen of old was not so much their conduct on the day of action, as the way in which they maintained their ships in readiness for this event and repaired them afterwards. It came from their close knowledge of the propelling power; not only how to work it to the best advantage, but how to preserve it from injury. We require the same intimacy with steam-power to produce a like result.

In support of the view that the supreme head of this fighting instrument does not require to know any details of his machinery, we are invited to contest or criticise a claim that one day's study of steam-power and modern gunnery would qualify a Drake, a Nelson or a Farragut to fight a naval battle with existing vessels. Into such a contest I am not disposed to enter, for it would entail absorbing nearly the entire space of this number, and my contribution is already long enough. I will only add a few remarks on the ordnance question. How "modern progress has reduced this department of marine warfare to a science quite distinct from that of managing or propelling the ship," I am at a loss to imagine. It would appear to me that the agencies which, in one case, propel a projectile and, in the other case, a piston or turbine are not entirely dissimilar. It would be a strange vessel in which the crew were split up into sections entirely ignorant of each other's business, for An American Citizen approves, I gather, even of encouraging officers to specialize in ordnance. He would have a distinct corps for this branch, as it "involves a separate application of science, which can best be pursued by men devoted to it." Having been a Gunnery as well as a Torpedo officer, I may be classed, presumably, as a specialist; but, so far from agreeing to augment specialization to the extent of a separate department, my feeling is to contract specialization and insist upon all officers being familiar with the forces and weapons they employ. By following that principle alone can we assure a good standard of professional knowledge in all, which will be of more value in the varied requirements of war than the highly specialized knowledge of a few whose safety until the end of the action we cannot insure.

E. EARDLEY-WILMOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR MISSIONARIES AND OUR COMMERCE.

BY RICHARD WEIGHTMAN.

PERHAPS the most touching spectacle presented by the hour is that of the missionaries endeavoring to explain the sinister crescendo of hostility to foreigners which is now rapidly approaching its climax in China. One would suppose that persons who have spent long years among the so-called heathen would by this time have acquired a clear understanding of their attitude, their standards and their springs of thought. The fact remains, however, that the missionaries in China, especially the American and English missionaries, are more hopelessly bewildered by the situation, and more pathetically unable to analyze its simplest phenomena, than even the spectator who contemplates it from a distance. Here and there, a missionary will stumble upon one of the contributory causes of the rapidly increasing animosity in question, namely, our harsh and humiliating treatment of Chinese persons who visit this country; but not one of them, so far as I know, has yet so much as yielded to a suspicion that the missionaries themselves have really furnished the spark by which the conflagration has been generated. It does not seem to have occurred to them that the very terms upon which they enter China constitute an affront to the nation, as well as to every Chinaman who cultivates a sense of self-respect and possesses intelligence enough to conduct a thought to a conclusion. Naturally, the victims of our immigration laws, and especially of the brutal and stupid manner in which they are all too frequently administered, return to their native land indignant if not revengeful. It is easily intelligible, moreover, that their kinsmen, friends and neighbors who become acquainted with the facts are quick to share the feeling. But it must be obvious that the chief ingredient of bitterness is furnished

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by our own arrogance—by the incredible insensibility with which we demand the indiscriminate admission to China of our missionaries, merchants, prospectors, tourists, etc., and by the blustering, browbeating, threatening manner we display when any of them encounters, or says that he encounters, the smallest overture of discourtesy or unfriendliness. The Chinese are human beings, just as we are. Their religion may not be as fine as ours, or their civilization as enlightened. But at least the religion and the civilization are theirs, handed down to them from a period when the progenitors of the Caucasian race were mere troglodytes. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the resentment of the Chinese, especially the upper classes, when they consider the contemptuous and cruel injustice of which we are the complacent perpetrators and they the helpless victims.

Here it is that the missionary becomes the chief representative of American aggression and the most potent inspiration of the Chinese grievance. In that vast and swarming empire, the missionary exemplifies—at least to ninety-nine out of every hundred of the population—the foreign invasion. Outside of the treaty ports and the capital, the natives rarely see an alien who is not a missionary. Of other aliens they know virtually nothing. The only "foreign devil" of whom they have the faintest conception is the clergyman who has come among them to proclaim the degradation of their accepted standards and the sinful error of their ancestors. To him is not unnaturally attributed every evil which they may imagine or perceive as the result of foreign intrusion and activity. From our point of view, the missionary is, of course, the innocent victim of circumstances ignorantly misunderstood. From the Chinese point of view, he constitutes the vanguard of the foray, the type of the persecuting horde. When they hear that their own people have been wronged, insulted and oppressed in foreign lands, they see in the missionary within their gates the one visible advocate and inspiration of the outrage. Is it not undeniable that the American people, thus invaded by Chinese evangelists, would exploit their just resentment far more promptly and effectually? The truth is, we proceed upon the hypothesis that the Chinese are benighted pagans, our inferiors in the social, moral and intellectual scale, and that we have a divine commission to uplift

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them, no matter at what cost to their sensibilities, their convictions or their self-respect.

The Hon. John W. Foster, who has occupied some of the most distinguished positions in American public life, delivered an address in Nashville, about the middle of March, his subject being the relation of diplomacy to Christian missions. Of course, Mr. Foster spoke with authority. Naturally, as a believer in the employment of our diplomatic agencies for the promotion of evangelical enterprises in heathen lands, he arrayed that remarkable expedient in the most attractive garb permitted by the facts. So we find him gravely explaining that the "Christian nations have found it necessary to exact from them [the pagan nations] the observance of what is termed the practice of *exterritoriality*." In plain words, this means that the Christian nations have combined to impose upon the pagan nations a tyranny to which the Christian nations would not dream of submitting—which they would resist to the last drop of blood and last dollar of treasure. Mr. Foster goes on to elaborate:

> "In general, it may be stated, subject to certain exceptions, that an American citizen resident or found in those [the pagan] countries, when charged with a crime or an offence againt the local law or custom, must be tried by his own diplomatic or consular representative, and if found guilty the punishment must be meted out by such officer. American citizens also enjoy certain other privileges in non-Christian countries which I have not time to detail."

It will be observed that the missionary is not explicitly mentioned in connection with the privileges and immunities which pagan nations have been compelled to grant to the citizens and subjects of Christian lands. Mr. Foster, however, could have told his hearers that, in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, it is the missionary who utilizes them and appeals to the State Department to enforce them. Of the concession known as "exterritoriality," therefore, the missionary is the chief beneficiary; and, since it is a concession extorted by menace and yielded under duress, we may easily understand that the Oriental mind accepts it as a wanton, grinding and undeserved humiliation.

It is no part of the purpose of this paper to consider the benefits conferred upon the heathen by the Christian propaganda. From the missionary point of view, those benefits are innumerable, as well as priceless. It is the heathen view which counts in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this case, however; and public sentiment cannot be either intelligent or just until it shall have been thoroughly informed. Our missionaries send back messages of good cheer and most excellent encouragement. From time to time, they revisit the land of their birth and explain to eager audiences the victories they have achieved for Christianity and civilization. But we hear only occasionally from the benighted millions whom we are doing so much to beatify and exalt, and then they speak to us almost wholly through the agencies of fire, blood and vengeance. There are two sides to this question, but we never consider the Oriental side until it is impressed upon us with the dagger and the torch, and even then we seem incapable of measuring its true significance. Even then, we blind ourselves to the fact that these barbarities may, after all, be the logical if not the inevitable fruit of a propaganda which needs to be launched with the aid of a treaty and kept in motion by the energy of fleets and armies. That the missionaries mean well and that, in most instances, they are sincere, unselfish and devoted laborers in a cause they implicitly accept as of divine authority, we must believe. That they are giving pleasure to the Prince of Peace, in whose name they prosecute their activities, many thoughtful men are inclined to doubt when they hear of savage tumults and still more savage massacres at almost every step along the path of Christian missionary activity. Certainly, Christianity presents a grotesque spectacle to the world when its apostles begin their work among the heathen by violating the Golden Rule of Jesus; and it would be ludicrous, if it were not so tragic and so terrible, to adumbrate the ultimate possibilities of a propaganda which derives its actuating force from a deliberate suppression of its vital principle.

Article XIV of the treaty with China (1903) begins thus:

> **"The principles of the Christian religion, as professed by the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches, are recognized as teaching men to do good, and to do to others as they would have others do to them."**

Imagine an irony more cynical! Our missionaries go to China to spread the gospel of Christianity, and they begin by doing to the Chinese—or having done to them by our Government—the very thing they would shed their blood to prevent the Chinese from doing to us! What answer would the United States make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a demand for "exterritoriality" in favor of the citizens or subjects of any Power upon earth? No need to put a question to which there can be but one reply! Yet Mr. Foster admits that "the Christian nations have found it necessary to exact," etc., and he frankly admits the oppressive nature of their exaction when he says: "The system of exterritoriality is one which makes the governments where it is enforced very restive, and they look forward more or less impatiently to the time when it may be abolished." Our Government, therefore, is enforcing upon China a system which galls and humiliates the Chinese, while our missionaries in that country are daily, hourly reminders of the affront. Why China submits to so gross an outrage of her sovereignty it were unprofitable to discuss at this time. The matter of chief interest for the moment is the growing probability that her submission will not endure much longer, even should the United States be willing to sacrifice the nation's material interests for the sake of maintaining an unwelcome religious propaganda in a foreign land. It is only too evident to those who have made dispassionate investigation in the premises that China's so-called "boycott" on our commerce has been inspired by hostility to the missionaries and what they represent. Moreover, there is abundant reason to believe that the State Department is keenly alive to the emergency, for in the confidential report of the Third Assistant Secretary, Mr. H. H. D. Peirce, who, a year or two ago, made an official inspection of our consulates in Eastern Asia, we find injurious reference to a certain consul as "closely identified with missionary interests." All present indications, indeed, point to the prevalence in Government circles of a very serious misgiving as to the wisdom of our present policy in China and the "heathen countries." Of course, our solicitude for the pagan soul, and our determination to save it if we can, are still in force; but another solicitude—that of selling our wares to the unbelievers—is now asserting itself, and the Government may eventually find a way to achieve abroad that divorce of church and state which the organic law compels us to observe at home.

One of the most intelligently observant travellers now living is General Geo. B. Williams, of Washington. He has seen more of the Orient, to say nothing of Turkey and Russia, than any other American of whom there is authentic record. His travels

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cover a period of thirty-five years, and they have taken him to the countries mentioned in important capacities, involving confidential relations with high Government officials and unbounded opportunities for accurate insight into moral, social, religious and business conditions. As far back as 1871, he was offered the position of "General Councillor of Finance" to the Mikado. The following year, acting as Special Commissioner to Japan, he visited the great money centres of Europe and negotiated a large loan on very favorable terms. Altogether, he was in the service of the Mikado five years, and his duties took him to many other foreign lands. Since then, he has had business affairs in Russia, Turkey and China, and has spent a long time in those parts of the world. It will be seen, then, that General Williams has had the experience necessary to make him an important witness touching missionary activities within the sphere of his personal observation; and it seems quite safe to assume that he is a witness of more than ordinary intelligence. He is the man who first called public attention to American missionary enterprise in the Turkish Empire, though our naval officers and our diplomatic representatives, having special knowledge of the facts, have long discussed in private conversation the conditions of which General Williams makes specific and detailed mention. For example, he has publicly asserted that a number of the United States consulates in Asia Minor are maintained for no visible purpose other than that of protecting and encouraging Turkish subjects, chiefly Armenians, in revolt and conspiracy against the lawful Government. These consulates are established at points where there is no commerce to look after, nor any other American interest to promote. They are operated by missionaries, for missionaries, and to no useful or legitimate public purpose. We cannot set up in these cases the plea that souls are saved, even though tumult and disorder may be incited by wicked men who hate Christianity. The Armenians are Christians, as they have been for centuries. There is no question of converting them, for they have professed the true faith always. As for saving a Moslem soul, there is no longer a serious pretence in that direction. Our missionary establishment in Asia Minor has for its sole object the education of the Sultan's Christian subjects in our language and, incidentally, our political ideas and methods.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The various public utterances of General Williams apparently stimulated the Government to careful inquiry; for, soon after the appearance in print of his earlier protests, a Senate Committee called upon the State Department for special information as to our consular establishment, and with very interesting results. Of course, the requisition was general and comprehensive in its terms; but the Senators must have been more or less astonished to find that a number of our commercial agents had no commerce to look after, and that so many consuls, vice-consuls, etc., were mere "missionaries." Such items as the following, for instance, no doubt contained much food for reflection, if very scant material for pride and satisfaction. They are taken from the official document in question, in which they appear under the heading "Turkey":

"*Alexandretta, Syria.*—Alexandretta is situated on the bay of Iskanderoon, in North Syria, and of greater importance than its population of 8,000 would seem to indicate, for it has the only natural harbor on the Syrian coast and is the *entrepôt* of a large and populous district. No American citizens reside in the town, but there are about 100 American missionaries living in different parts of the consular district. The duties of this consulate concern invoices, bills of health and the protection of the interests of American missionaries residing in the district; also work of a notarial character. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, twenty-eight invoices were certified, twelve bills of health issued and eighteen letters of inquiry from American business men received and answered. William Ross Davis, consul, was born in Ohio, is thirty-six years of age and a teacher by profession; appointed consul, July 21, 1899.

"*Bassorah.*—Bassorah, Turkey, is situated on the Shat-el-Arab River, fifty-five miles from the Persian Gulf, and has a population of between 20,000 and 30,000. It is the centre of the largest date-growing district in the world. The chief duties of this agency consist of certifying invoices, issuing bills of health and protecting the interests of American missionaries. About forty invoices are certified annually.

"*Beirut, Syria.*—Beirut is the chief city of Syria and Palestine, commercially, educationally and politically. Official duties concern the protection of resident American citizens with their religious, educational and charitable establishments, and of American tourists; the extension of American commerce; invoices; births, deaths and marriages; judicial functions; customs immunities for missionaries; admittance of American citizens of Syrian origin to their native land, besides ordinary official and notarial work.

"This consular district embraces nearly all of Syria and more than two-thirds of Palestine, besides the island of Cyprus. Its total American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population is in the neighborhood of 725 souls. More than $1,000,000 of American money is invested in this district, principally in schools, churches and hospitals ($835,000), but also in factories, farms and dwelling-houses. In this consular district there are some 375 persons of Syrian birth claiming American protection, and the consulate is constantly being called on to intervene in their behalf. The Syrian Protestant College, at Beirut, an American university, has now an attendance of 600 students from all parts of the Levant, including Egypt, Greece, Asia Minor, Persia and Syria. Its teaching force consists of twenty-five American professors and tutors, fourteen Arabic and Turkish instructors of French. The number of college buildings has increased from one to twelve in thirty years, and building operations are still progressing. A school of commerce was last year added to the other departments of which the medical, perhaps, is the most important. It is said to be the largest American institution of learning, of its high standard, outside of the United States.

"*Erzerum.*—There are four Americans at Erzerum engaged in school and missionary work. The duties of the consulate are light, and mainly consist of guarding American interests, endeavoring to increase and extend American commerce, and in reporting such events as may be of interest. The consulate is open for public business from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

"*Trebizond.*—The ordinary duties of the consular agency consist in authenticating invoices, aiding American missionaries and protecting United States citizens. During the fiscal year, twenty letters of inquiry from American business men were answered and twenty-six invoices certified. Office hours are from 10 A.M. to 4 P.M. daily, except Sundays and bank holidays.

"*Harput.*—The population is now about 20,000. The mission of the A. B. C. F. M., and the extensive series of buildings occupied by Euphrates College, are located on the western edge of the city. The college, with its primary and preparatory departments, is attended by over 1,000 pupils. The climate of both cities is healthful and comfortable. The resident American colony at Harput and Mezerch numbers twenty-eight native-born Americans and their children (twenty-one adult native born, seven children). At Mardin, in this consular district, there are four adult native-born Americans and one child. Most of the children above enumerated have been born in this Empire. With the exception of the consul and his family, the above mentioned are all engaged in missionary or educational work. There are, in addition, in this consular district, about 300 naturalized American citizens, all originally from the region and of the Armenian race. The majority intend to return to America, and are here to visit relatives, settle up estates, sell property, etc. They are, as a rule, very loyal Americans, proud of their citizenship, and extremely helpful in carrying out the plans of the consulate for establishing commercial relations. The consulate is open from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M. Four invoices were certified during the six months ending June 30, 1901. During the same period eighteeen inquiries from business firms in the United States were answered, and information has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been supplied, in response to nineteen requests, concerning emigration, passport conditions, inheritances, property interests, etc.

"*Sivas.*—The principal duties of this consulate consist of the protection of American citizens residing in the district and of American mission property. But two invoices of goods shipped to the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

"*Samsoun.*—No American citizens reside in Samsoun. The duties of this agency consist of the certification of an occasional invoice, the protection of American missionaries in their dealings with the custom officials, and the visé of passports of American teachers."

This remarkable record could be extended indefinitely, but a few instances in China will be enough to complete the illustration. From the same official document we quote, as regards Canton, Hankau, Chefoo, Chinkiang and so on, the monotonous comment by the State Department:

"The principal duties of this consulate concern invoices, certificates of Chinese emigrating to the United States, protection of Americans and of American missionary property and converts."

Or, taking the case of Chinkiang:

"The principal duties of this consulate consist of the protection of about 200 American missionaries living in the district, and the exercise of judicial functions."

It is the same story in all cases. Wherever the missionary goes, there is need of protection. Wherever "converts" are found, our consuls are engaged in "judicial functions."

It is not here proposed to discuss the merits of missionary work as such. Perhaps our evangelists do, here and there, convert a heathen in the true meaning of the term. The proposition has been combated by many responsible Americans who have looked into the matter without prejudice, and who seriously declare that the so-called "converts" merely profess Christianity in order to obtain certain substantial secular advantages and immunities. Be that as it may, the practical question before the country is whether the United States Government should permit itself to continue in partnership with a religious propaganda. Obviously, neither our nation as a whole nor our merchants, manufacturers and financiers in particular, can expect to retain the good-will of any foreign peoples upon whom we lay the hand of insult and oppression through official agencies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been shown in this article that the United States Government has "exacted" from the Chinese and other non-Christian governments a recognition of our claim of "exterritoriality"—a claim which no nation on earth would dare to assert in the United States, and which we would not dream of asserting in Great Britain or any other Empire capable of resenting an affront so gross. (It is a significant circumstance, by the way, that this pretension was promptly withdrawn in the case of Japan, seven or eight years ago, when the Mikado, very diplomatically of course, served notice that it would be no longer tolerated.) It has been shown further that, while the missionaries and their alleged "converts" are the only beneficiaries of this oppressive and tyrannical system, our commerce—in China, at least—has been seriously impaired, and is now even threatened with extinction, as a direct result of the arrangement. We have a number of consulates in China whose incumbents seem to have little to do beyond "protecting missionaries, their property and their converts," and we know that a majority of them spend a great part of their time conducting, as intermediaries, the more or less acrimonious controversies that prevail almost continually between our evangelists and the Chinese officials. In Asia Minor, we are maintaining a number of consulates for no visible purpose but that of promoting missionary activities which are notoriously offensive to the Turkish Government and people. With the one non-Christian country which has denied to our missionaries the privilege of "exterritoriality" our trade is increasing. In Asia Minor we have practically no trade at all, and in China American commerce is rapidly approaching the point of final and complete attenuation.

Congress has just enacted a law reforming the consular service, providing for an improvement of its organization and its personnel. It would be interesting to know just how and to what extent Secretary Root expects to expand the volume of our trade in empires such as China, where the most conspicuous representatives of American interests are representatives also of an invasion which insults the national sense of dignity and operates agencies, at once powerful and sleepless, of popular discontent.

RICHARD WEIGHTMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON.—II.

BY HENRY JAMES.

III.

ONE might have been sure in advance that the character of a democracy would nowhere more sharply mark itself than in the democratic substitute for a court city, and Washington is cast in the mould that expresses most the absence of salient social landmarks and constituted features. Here it is that conversation, as the only invoked presence, betrays a little its inadequacy to the furnishing forth, all by itself, of an outward view. It tells us it must be there, since in all the wide empty vistas nothing else is, and the general elimination *can* but have left it. A pleading, touching effect, indeed, lurks in this sense of it as seated, at receipt of custom, by any decent door of any decent domicile and watching the vacancy for reminder and appeal. It is left to conversation alone to people the scene with accents; putting aside two or three objects to be specified, there is *never* an accent in it, up and down, far and wide, save such as fall rather on the ear of the mind: those projected by the social spirit starved for the sense of an occasional emphasis. The White House is an accent —one of the lightest, sharpest possible; and the Capitol, of course, immensely, another; though the latter falls on the exclusively political page, as to which I have been waiting to say a word. It should meanwhile be mentioned that we are promised these enhancements, these illustrations, of the great general text, on the most magnificent scale; a splendid projected and announced Washington of the future, with approaches even now grandly outlined and massively marked; in face of which one should, perhaps, confess to the futility of any current estimate. If I speak thus of the Capitol, however, let me not merely brush past the White House to get to it—any more than to feel free to enter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it without some preliminary stare at that wondrous Library of Congress which glitters in fresh and almost unmannerly emulation, almost frivolous irrelevance of form, in the neighborhood of the greater building. About the ingenuities and splendors of this last costly structure, a riot of rare material and rich ornament, there would doubtless be much to say—did not one everywhere, on all such ground, meet the open eye of criticism simply to establish with it a private intelligence, simply to respond to it by a deprecating wink. The guardian of that altar, I think, is but too willing, on such a hint, to let one pass without the sacrifice.

It is a case again here, as on fifty other occasions, of the tribute instantly paid by the revisiting spirit; but paid, all without question, to the general *kind* of presence for which the noisy air, over the land, feels, so sensibly, an inward ache—the presence that corresponds there, no matter how loosely, to that of the housing and harboring European Church in the ages of great disorder. The Universities and the greater Libraries (the smaller, for a hundred good democratic reasons, are another question,) repeat, in their manner, to the imagination, East and West, the note of the old thick-walled convents and quiet cloisters: they are large and charitable, they are sturdy, often proud and often rich, and they have the incalculable value that they represent the only intermissions to inordinate rapacious traffic that the scene offers to view. With this suggestion of sacred ground, they play even upon the most restless of analysts as they will, making him face about, with ecstasy, any way they seem to point; so that he feels it his business much less to count over their shortcomings than to proclaim them places of enchantment. They are better at their worst than anything else at its best, and the comparatively sweet sounds that stir their theoretic stillness are for him as echoes of the lyre of Apollo. The Congressional Library is magnificent, and would become thus a supreme sanctuary even were it ten times more so: there would seem to be nothing then but to pronounce it a delight and have done with it—or let the appalled imagination, in other words, slink into it and stay there. But here is pressed, precisely, with particular force, the spring of the question that takes but a touch to sound: is the case of this remarkable creation, by exception, a case in which the violent waving of the pecuniary wand *has* incontinently produced in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terest? The answer can only be, I feel, a shy assent—though shy, indeed, only till the logic of the matter is apparent. This logic is that, though money alone can gather in on such a scale the treasures of knowledge, these treasures, in the form of books and documents, themselves organize and furnish their world. They appoint and settle the proportions, they thicken the air, they people the space, they create and consecrate all their relations, and no one shall say that, where they scatter life, which they themselves in fact *are*, history does not promptly attend. Emphatically yes, therefore, the great domed and tiered, galleried and statued central hall of the Congressional, the last word of current constructional science and artistic resource, already crowns itself with that grace.

The graceful thing in Washington beyond any other, none the less, is the so happily placed and featured White House, the late excellent extensions and embellishments of which have of course represented expenditure—but only of the refined sort imposed by some mature portionless gentlewoman on relatives who have accepted the principle of making her, at a time of life, more honorably comfortable. The whole ample precinct and margin formed by the virtual continuity of its grounds with those expanses in which the effect of the fine Washington Obelisk rather spends or wastes itself (not a little as if some loud monosyllable had been uttered, in a preoccupied company, without a due production of sympathy or sense)—the fortunate isolation of the White House, I say, intensifies its power to appeal to that musing and mooning visitor whose perceptions alone, in all the conditions, I hold worthy of account. Hereabouts, beyond doubt, history had from of old seemed to me insistently seated, and I remember a short spring-time of years ago when Lafayette Square itself, contiguous to the Executive Mansion, could create a rich sense of the past by the use of scarce other witchcraft than its command of that pleasant perspective, and its possession of the most prodigious of all Presidential effigies, Andrew Jackson, as archaic as a Ninevite king, prancing and rocking through the ages. If that atmosphere, moreover, in the fragrance of the Washington April, was even a quarter of a century since as a liquor of bittersweet taste, overflowing its cup, what was the ineffable mixture now, with all the elements further distilled, all the life further sacrificed, to make it potent? One circled about the place as for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting the ghosts, and one paused, under the same impulse, before the high palings of the White House drive, as if wondering at haunted ground. There the ghosts stood in their public array, spectral enough and clarified; yet scarce making it easier to "place" the strange, incongruous blood-drops, as one looked through the rails, on that revised and freshened page. But one fortunately has one's choice, in all these connections, as one turns away; the mixture, as I have called it, is really here so fine. General Jackson, in the centre of the Square, still rocks his hobby and the earth; but the fruit of the interval, to my actual eyes, hangs nowhere brighter than in the brilliant memorials, lately erected, to Lafayette and to Rochambeau. Artful, genial, expressive, the tribute of French talent, these happy images supply, on the spot, the note without which even the most fantasticating sense of our national past would feel itself rub forever against mere brown homespun. Everything else gives way, for me, I confess, as I again stand before them; everything, whether as historic fact, or present *agrément,* or future possibility, yields to this one high luxury of our old friendship with France.

The "artistic" Federal city already announced spreads itself then before us, in plans elaborated even to the finer details, a city of palaces and monuments and gardens, symmetries and circles and far radiations, with the big Potomac for water-power and water-effect and the recurrent Maryland spring, so prompt and so full-handed, for a perpetual benediction. This image has, above all, the value, for the considering mind, that it presents itself as under the wide-spread wings of the general Government, which fairly make it figure to the rapt vision as the object caught up in eagle claws and lifted into fields of air that even the high brows of the municipal boss fail to sweep. The wide-spread wings affect us, in the prospect, as great fans that, by their mere tremor, will blow the work, at all steps and stages, clean and clear, disinfect it, quite ideally, of any germ of the job, and prepare thereby for the American voter, on the spot and in the pride of possession, quite a new kind of civic consciousness. The scheme looms largest, surely, as a demonstration of the possibilities of that service to him, and nothing about it will be more interesting than to measure—though this may take time—the nature and degree of his alleviation. Will the new pride I speak of sufficiently inflame him? Will the taste of the new consciousness,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finding him so fresh to it, prove the right medicine? One can only regret that we must still rather indefinitely wait to see—and regret it all the more that there is always, in America, yet another lively source of interest involved in the execution of such designs, and closely involved just in proportion as the high intention, the formal majesty, of the thing seems assured. It comes back to what we constantly feel, throughout the country, to what the American scene everywhere depends on for half its appeal or its effect; to the fact that the social conditions, the material, pressing and pervasive, make the particular experiment or demonstration, whatever it may pretend to, practically a new and incalculable thing. This general Americanism is often the one tag of character attaching to the case after every other appears to have abandoned it. The thing is happening, or will have to happen, in the American way—that American way which is more different from all other native ways, taking country with country, than any of these latter are different from each other; and the question is of how, each time, the American way will see it through.

The element of suspense—beguilement, ever, of the sincere observer—is provided for by the fact that, though this American way never fails to come up, he has to recognize as by no means equally true that it never fails to succeed. It is inveterately applied, but with consequences bewilderingly various; which means, however, for our present moral, but that the certainty of the *determined* American effect is an element to attend quite especially such a case as the employment of the arts of design, on an unprecedented scale, for public uses, the adoption on this scale of the whole æsthetic law. Encountered in America, phenomena of this order strike us mostly as occurring in the historic void, as having to present themselves in the hard light of that desert, and as needing to extort from it, so far as they can, something of the shading of their interest. Encountered in older countries, they show, on the contrary, as taking up the references, as consenting perforce to the relations, of which the air is already full, and as having thereby much rather to get themselves expressive by charm than to get themselves expressive by weight. The danger "in Europe" is of their having too many things to say, and too many others to distinguish these from; the danger in the States is of their not having things enough—with enough

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tone and resonance furthermore to give them. What therefore will the multitudinous and elaborate forms of the Washington to come have to "say," and what, above all, besides gold and silver, stone and marble and trees and flowers, will they be able to say it *with?* That is one of the questions in the mere phrasing of which the restless analyst finds a thrill. There is a thing called interest that has to be produced for him—positively as if he were a rabid usurer with a clutch of his imperilled bond. He has seen again and again how the most expensive effort often fails to lead up to interest, and he has seen how it may bloom in soil of no more worth than so many layers of dust and ashes. He has learnt in fact—he learns greatly in America—to mistrust any plea for it *directly* made by money, which operates too often as the great puffing motor-car framed for whirling him, in his dismay, quite away from it. And he has inevitably noted, at the same time, from how comparatively few other sources this rewarding dividend on his invested attention may be drawn. He thinks of these sources as few, that is, because he sees the same ones—those are references by which interest is fed—used again and again, with a desperate economy; sees the same ones, even as the human heroes, celebrities, extemporized lions, or scapegoats, required social and educational figure-heads and "values," having to serve in *all* the connections and adorn all the tales. That is one of the liveliest of his American impressions. He has at moments his sense that, in presence of such vast populations and instilled, emulous demands, there is not, outside the mere economic, enough native history, recorded or current, to go round.

IV.

It seemed to me on the spot, moreover, that such reflections were rather more than less pertinent in face of the fact that I was again to find the Capitol, whenever I approached, and above all whenever I entered it, a vast and many-voiced creation. The thing depends, of course, somewhat on the visitor, who will be the more responsive, I think, the further back into the "origins" of the whole American spectacle his personal vision shall carry him; but this hugest, as I suppose it, of all the homes of debate only asks to put forth, on opportunity, an incongruous, a various, an inexhaustible charm. I may as well say at once that I had found myself from the first adoring the Capitol, though I may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not pretend here to dot all the i's of all my reasons—since some of these might appear below the dignity of the subject, and others alien to its simplicity. The ark of the American covenant may strike one thus, at any rate, as a compendium of all the national ideals, a museum, crammed full, even to overflowing, of all the national terms and standards, weights and measures and emblems of greatness and glory, and indeed as a builded record of half the collective vibrations of a people; their conscious spirit, their public faith, their bewildered taste, their ceaseless curiosity, their arduous and interrupted education. Such were to my vision at least some of its aspects, but the place had a hundred sides, and, if I had had time to look for others still, I felt I should have found them. What it comes to—whereby the "pull," in America, is of the greatest—is that association really reigns there, and in the richest, and even again and again in the drollest, forms; it is thick and vivid and almost gross, it assaults the wondering mind. The labyrinthine pile becomes thus inordinately *amusing* —taking the term in its finer modern sense. The analogy may seem forced, but it affected me as playing in Washington life very much the part that St. Peter's, of old, had seemed to me to play in Roman: it offered afternoon entertainment, at the end of a longish walk, to any spirit in the humor for the uplifted and flattered vision—and this without suggesting that the sublimities in the two cases, even as measured by the profanest minds, tend at all to be equal. The Washington dome is indeed capable in the Washington air, of admirable, of sublime, effects; and there are cases in which, seen at a distance above its yellow Potomac, it varies but by a shade from the sense—yes, absolutely the divine campagna-sense—of St. Peter's and the like-colored Tiber.

But the question is positively of the impressiveness of the great terraced Capitol hill, with its stages and slopes, staircases and fountains, its general presentation of its charge. And if the whole mass and prospect "amuse," as I say, from the moment they are embraced, the visitor curious of the *democratic assimilation* of the greater dignities and majesties will least miss the general logic. That is the light in which the whole thing is supremely interesting; the light of the fact, illustrated at every turn, that the populations maintaining it deal with it so directly and intimately, so sociably and humorously. We promptly take

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in that, if ever we are to commune in a concentrated way with the sovereign people, and see their exercised power raise a side-wind irony for forms and arrangements other than theirs, the occasion here will amply serve. Indubitably, moreover, at a hundred points, the irony operates, and all the more markedly under such possible interference; the interference of the monumental spittoons, that of the immense amount of vulgar, of barbaric, decoration, that of the terrible artistic tributes from, and scarce less to, the different States—the unassorted marble mannikins in particular, each a portrayal by one of the commonwealths of her highest worthy, which make the great Rotunda, the intended Valhalla, resemble a stonecutter's collection of priced sorts and sizes. Discretion exists, throughout, only as a flower of the very first or of these very latest years; the large middle time, corresponding, and even that unequally, with the English Victorian, of sinister memory, was unacquainted with the name, and waits there now, in its fruits, but for some far-flaring act-of-faith of the future: a sacrifice to the æsthetic law which one already feels stirring the air, so that it may arrive, I think, with an unexampled stride. Nothing will have been more interesting, surely, than so public a wiping-over of the æsthetic slate, with all the involved collective compunctions and repudiations, the general exhibition of a colossal conscience, a conscience proportionate to the size and wealth of the country. To such grand gestures does the American scene lend itself!

The elements in question are meanwhile there, in any case, just as the sovereign people are there, "going over" their property; but we are aware none the less of impressions—that of the ponderous proud Senate, for instance, so sensibly massive; that of the Supreme Court, so simply, one almost says so chastely, yet, while it breathes supremacy, so elegantly, so all intellectually, in session—under which the view, taking one extravagance with another, recurs rather ruefully to glimpses elsewhere caught, glimpses of authority emblazoned, bewigged, bemantled, bemarshalled, in almost direct defeat of its intention of gravity. For the reinstated absentee, in these presences, the mere recovery of native privilege was at all events a balm—after too many challenged appeals and abused patiences, too many hushed circuitous creepings, among the downtrodden, in other and more bristling halls of state. The sense of a certain large, final be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nignity in the Capitol comes then, I think, from this impression, that the national relation to it is that of a huge flourishing Family to the place of business, the estate-office, where, in a myriad open ledgers, which offer no obscurity to the hereditary head for figures, the account of their colossal revenue is kept. They meet there in safe sociability, as all equally initiated and interested—not as in a temple or a citadel, but by the warm domestic hearth of Columbia herself; a motherly, chatty, clear-spectacled Columbia, who reads all the newspapers, knows, to the last man, every one of her sons by name, and, to the last boy, even her grandsons, and is fenced off, at the worst, but by concentric circles of rocking-chairs. It is impossible, as I say, not to be fondly conscious of her welcome—unless again, and yet again, I read into the general air, confusedly, too much of the happy accident of the basis of my introduction. But if my sensibility responds, with intensity, to this, so much the better; for what were such felt personal aids and influences, after all, but cases and examples, embodied expressions of character, type, distinction, products of the *working* of the whole thing?—specimens, indeed, highly concentrated and refined, and made thereby, I admit, more charming and insidious.

It must also be admitted, that to exchange the outer aspects of the vast monument for the inner is to be reminded with some sharpness of a Washington in which half the sides that have held our attention drop, as if rather abashed, out of sight. Not its pleasant brightness as of a winter watering-place, not its connections, however indirect, with the older, but those with the newer, the newest, civilization, seem matter of recognition for its various marble fronts; it rakes the prospect, it rakes the continent, to a much more sweeping purpose, and is visibly concerned but in immeasurable schemes of which it can consciously remain the centre. Here, in the vast spaces—mere empty light and air, though such pleasant air and such pretty light as yet—the great Federal future seems, under vague bright forms, to hover and to stalk, making the horizon recede to take it in, making the terraces too, below the long colonnades, the admirable standpoints, the sheltering porches, of political philosophy. The comparatively new wings of the building filled me, whenever I walked here, with thanksgiving for their large and perfect elegance: so, in Paris, might the wide mated fronts that are of such a noble

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effect on either side of the Rue Royale shine in multiplied majesty and recovered youth over an infinite Place de la Concorde. These parts of the Capitol, on their Acropolis height, are ideally constructed for "raking," and for this suggestion of their dominating the American scene in playhouse gallery fashion. You are somehow possessed of it *all* while you tread them—their marble embrace appears so the compliment of the vast democratic lap. Though I had them in general, for contemplation, quite to myself, I met one morning a trio of Indian braves, braves dispossessed of forest and prairie, but as free of the builded labyrinth as they had ever been of these; also arrayed in neat pot-hats, shoddy suits and light overcoats, with their pockets, I am sure, full of photographs and cigarettes: circumstances all that quickened their resemblance on the much bigger scale, to Japanese celebrities, or to specimens, on show, of what the Government can do with people with whom it is supposed able to do nothing. They seemed just then and there, for a mind fed betimes on the Leatherstocking Tales, to project as in a flash an image in itself immense but foreshortened and simplified—reducing to a single smooth stride the bloody footsteps of time. One rubbed one's eyes, but there, at its highest polish, shining in the beautiful day, was the brazen face of history, and there, all about one, immaculate, the printless pavements of the State.

HENRY JAMES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAN-ISLAM.

BY ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

THE great part played by the religion of Mahomet in shaping the history of the world, and the extent to which it is still the guiding principle with a large proportion of the human race, make the question of the vital force of Islam one of the most interesting and important in politico-ethical studies. At one time, it looked as if the Crescent, and not the Cross, was to be the dominant power in Europe; and to-day the religion of the Prophet is spreading both in Asia and Africa in a manner which is not without political significance.

It is necessary to understand, at all events in outline, the character and genesis of this religion, which has several features differentiating it from the other two great moral and ethical systems. In the first place, Mahomet the Prophet preached to his little world of polytheistic Arabs the doctrine of One God—all-wise and all-powerful—a conception not exceeded in beauty by any other revelation. From the first, however, Islam was not so much idealistic and spiritual; it was rather a social and political code, built round the essential doctrine of monotheism. Jewish influence, especially that of the Old Testament, had much to do with shaping the later development of Islam; but it does not appear that the Prophet knew the Jewish scriptures. However that may be, the Mosaic dispensation forms the closest analogy to that of Mahomet, and it is impossible to estimate how much of this is due to actual contact or how much is merely the result of a similar cast of mind in the lawgivers and of similar environment.

Islam is not only religion but law, and the law is as essential to the religion as the religion to the law. Whereas the legislation of Christian countries is based on the progressive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasonings of the human mind, assisted by the spiritual conception of Christianity, the Moslem law was fixed and decided by the Prophet alone. The principal orthodox authorities are the Koran — the "Word of God" —and the conduct of the Prophet. These two sources are acknowledged by all the Moslem world, except the Shiites, as infallible, just as all orthodox Christianity regards the Bible as the bed-rock of its authority; but, in both religions, the matter of interpretation has given rise to innumerable dissensions. There are five Mohammedan schools of interpretation which, recognizing not only these two original sources but two others, are regarded as orthodox. The five schools differentiate the Moslem world, and the code favored by the ruler of a particular country is that which has complete jurisdiction within his domains. Only those sects which reject certain of the orthodox authorities are regarded as "heretics," a distinction which differs somewhat from the Christian definition, and Moslem heresies, such as those of the Wahabites and Babites, arose out of the mystical conceptions of their founders who refused to accept certain of the orthodox sources.

To understand the method on which the faith and practice of Islam are built up, it is necessary to realize that there is no prohibition to progress or change. Thus the most modern inventions and novel ideas may be fitted into the Moslem system, but they must become part of it, a process which is accomplished by finding reasons or justifications for them in the orthodox sources. The Oriental mind has no difficulty in working these out, and this elasticity and power of adaptation have been the most powerful weapons in the Moslem propaganda. In China, for instance, where the worship of ancestors—one of the most deep-rooted customs in the history of the human race—came into direct conflict with the monotheistic conceptions of Islam and Christianity alike, the latter refused to compromise and was nearly rooted out and became anathema, while the former, incorporating the family rites in its own ritual, continued to make steady progress. The conversion of the whole Malay race to Islam was the result of a similar method of peaceful penetration; and, in fact, although in its earlier stages the religion of Mahomet was essentially militant and was for several centuries inspired by keen fanaticism, it has accomplished a silent and peaceful propagandism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is unnecessary for the purposes of this article to enter into any account of the various dissensions in the Islamic world; but the two great divisions may be mentioned here, because they represent a wide historical split in the Moslem camp. The first four Caliphs who succeeded Mahomet were his friends and converts, and they are acknowledged by the Sunnites, who also accept as authentic the six books of Traditions which are the third orthodox source of Moslem law. The Shiites, on the contrary, deny the validity of the claims of the three first Caliphs, and allow only those of the fourth, Ali. After the death of Ali's son, Hosein, these claims were continued in the persons of the *imams*, who met with violent deaths, and with the disappearance of the last *imam* the claims were finally lost; but hopes are still retained of the reappearance one day of the last *imam*, who will revive Islam. This is the origin of Mahdiism, the appearance of false Mahdis and so many conflicts in different parts of the world. After the first four Caliphs, those who succeeded them were little more than usurpers, having, in fact, no succession from the Prophet. The Ommayades of the sixth, the Abbasides of the eighth, the Egyptian Fatimides of the tenth century, and the Ottomans (who finally established their dynasty at Constantinople in 1453 on the ruins of the Byzantine Empire) were none of them legitimate descendants or successors of the Prophet.

In 1517, however, Sultan Selim I, having conquered Syria and Egypt and assumed the title of "Protector of the Holy Places" (Mecca and Medina), concluded an agreement with the then Sheik of Mecca (a legitimate descendant of the Abbaside Caliphs) whereby the Ottoman sultans were invested with the title of "Caliph," assuming charge of the holy relics which are the insignia of Islam. This title has ever since been the property of the Sultans of Constantinople, but how far it is now acknowledged by the Moslem world is a much-disputed question. The early success of Islam was exceptionally brilliant, but it must be remembered that the sixth and seventh centuries, during which the Caliphate was founded, were periods of great exhaustion and degeneration in the Christian world, and that the valor and virility of the Arabs, inspired with a new and lofty conception and accompanied by a toleration for which they have not received sufficient credit, made the hosts of Islam a most formidable force in world history. For a long time, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ottoman Caliphs continued on this path of success; but the tide turned at length, corruption and satiety undermined the Moslem Powers, while the Christian ones emerged from the Dark Ages into a period of heroic endeavor.

As the power of the Crescent waned, the Ottomans were driven from Europe and Europeans invaded Asia and Africa. The prestige of the Caliphate naturally decreased. Those of the Ottoman sultans who, in the nineteenth century, attempted to arrest the decay of their country by reforms based on Western ideas achieved no success, and were regarded with disfavor by their coreligionists and even excommunicated by some of the stricter sects or brotherhoods. Both the Reform sultans and the Egyptian Khedives, swayed by European influence, fell under the ban of these brotherhoods; and Abdul-Hamid, when he ascended the throne, had to prove his orthodoxy and freedom from Western influence before he could enjoy any sense of security with his own people. It took him nearly twenty years of hard work, during which he eliminated from his Court all those suspected of Western tendencies and frowned on the party which favored administrative reform. His most successful policy, however, was one of ingratiation with the devout among his coreligionists by his protection of holy men, sheiks and pilgrims. When there was no money to pay the wages of the army or court officials, there was still some for presents to these; and the Mecca-Medina railway, linking the Holy Places with the coast, has brought him the gratitude of millions of people from the ends of the Mohammedan world. The final touch was put by the success of his arms over the Greeks, which, announced to distant Moslem communities with Oriental hyperbole, conveyed the impression of a conquest over Europe. Even the victories of Kitchener over the false Mahdi in Egypt were turned to the glory of the Caliph, whose spiritual pretensions had been threatened by the impostor.

The claim of the Sultans of Constantinople to the title of Caliph was never contested, except by the Sultan of Morocco, until the time of the French invasion of Algeria and the era of the Reform sultans. There remained, nevertheless, a lack of sanction to Abdul-Hamid's pretensions which was now to be supplied as far as possible by the highest spiritual authorities. It must be recollected, however, that no hierarchy exists in Islam

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with authority like that acknowledged in Christianity, and that the recognition now accorded to him does not carry with it the weight which it might otherwise possess. In 1886, the great brotherhood of the Senoussi, of which an account must be given later, received the Sultan into their ranks; and twelve years later they formally acknowledged him as the true inheritor of the Abbaside Caliphs and the legitimate head of the world of Islam. The event was commemorated by embassies from the Porte to various Moslem centres throughout the world, and for twelve months afterwards Constantinople continued to receive deputations of homage and congratulation.

The brotherhood of the Senoussi is becoming known, even in journalistic circles in Europe. Its name is continually cropping up in connection with affairs in Algeria and even in Nigeria and Central Africa. It is the most important organization of its kind, although several others exist and have existed since the eleventh century. Originally theological schools, these brotherhoods occupied themselves until the last century with controversial questions of interpretation, legal and mystical abstractions and cognate matters; but, under pressure of the French invasion and of European encroachment generally, they gradually assumed a politico-religious character. The founder of the Senoussi claimed descent from Hosein, the murdered son of Ali and Fatima, and had the right to wear the green turban, thereby fulfilling one of the conditions of Mahdiism. The key-note of the Senoussi propaganda is uncompromising resistance to European influence and a return to the early militant spirit of Islam.

The growth of the Senoussi has been one of the most striking developments of modern Islam. They have adopted an active missionary policy and have spread southwards through heathen Africa, while their organization has been framed with the idea of including and coordinating all existing brotherhoods. The Senoussi have established in all countries where the Moslem is governed by an alien race a system of occult government side by side, and coinciding in its boundaries, with the state administration. This occult government exists in Algeria, Egypt, and India, and its emissaries are at work in Nigeria. The Senoussi now include within their brotherhood practically all the Sunnis, that is the majority of Moslems in Arabia, Turkey, North Africa, Turkestan, Afghanistan and East Asia. The Shiites,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who predominate in Persia, are alone prevented by their conception of orthodoxy from being Senoussi.

The Senoussi had their headquarters at Djarboub, but some twenty years ago it was decided to send their official representative to Constantinople, and the venerable Mokkadem who occupies this position is even more powerful in councils than the Sheik ul Islam, who, nominated by the Sultan, occupies in the hierarchy the place of Expounder of the Law, second only to that of the Caliph, the "Shadow of God on Earth."

The question of the extent of the Sultan's influence, and the proportion of the Moslem world which recognizes him as the head of their religion, is a difficult one. There are dissentient voices, even in his immediate entourage, among those who desire radical changes in the political system of Turkey in order to bring it up to European standards of efficiency and progress. That the Young Turkey party is not entirely disinterested in this propaganda goes without saying,—there is little disinterestedness in any political life, and none in Oriental countries. On the other hand, a considerable body of orthodox and non-progressive Moslems, such as the Shiites, do not recognize the Sultan's claims as Caliph, because of the break in what we might call the Apostolic succession. Moreover, Morocco disputes, and has always disputed, the claims of Constantinople, and has pretensions itself to be the seat of the legitimate descendants of the Prophet. Therefore both sections of the Moslem world, the modern and the fanatical, are in part opposed to the Sultan's claims. His strongest position lies in the protection he exercises over the Holy Places; and, when this is remembered, the skill of his diplomacy and the wisdom of his policy become more apparent to an outside world which is too prone to regard all Oriental potentates as monuments of incompetency. When, therefore, we begin to consider the possibility of a Pan-Islamic revival, it is not wise to discount too freely any of the circumstances which seem to point towards a renewal of Moslem activity or towards centralization. At the same time, it is historically true that the Moslem world has never been united, even under stress of circumstances, as Christendom united in the Crusades. Neither the Moors in Spain nor the Moslems in Egypt, India, or Persia were ever helped by the Turks, even when the Osmanlis were at the highest point of their power;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, in modern times, Abdul-Kadr received no support from outside in his gallant struggle against the French, and, indeed, he did not even secure the undivided allegiance of the Moslems of Algeria. Moreover, as Professor Vambéry says, in his recent work, "Western Culture in Eastern Lands":

> "The proposed association and the united action of the various component parts of an ethnical body dispersed in many different climates and divided into many nationalities presuppose a cultural level and a political fitness which is certainly not yet reached by the Islamic world. . . . The historic past, ethnical and ethical characteristics, and natural proclivities have formed a chasm which will be difficult to bridge over either in the present or the near future."

At the present time, more than two-thirds of the Moslem world are living under foreign rule, and a still greater proportion if we include those under foreign influence. The believers in the possibility of Pan-Islam point to a great improvement in the cultural status of Moslems generally, but they forget how greatly this is due to the imposition, under foreign domination, of an alien civilization. In India, the Moslems resisted the efforts to Europeanize them, just as the Moslems of Turkestan, under the influence of their fanatical Mollahs, still resist the educational efforts of Russia; but a new era has set in within the British Asiatic Empire, and the Mohammedans of India are now in the forefront of educational progress.

The quickening influence, however, has been contact with Europe, and therefore it is impossible to regard this phenomenon as part of a purely Pan-Islamic revival. The same argument must apply even to the undoubted progress made in Turkey, where there are the beginnings of public education, an improvement in the status of women, and a general breaking down of ancient superstitions. Orthodox Moslems no longer fear to travel abroad; the ignorant contempt for all foreigners as "heathens" has given way to a more just appreciation. Even the superstition which grew up round the Islamic doctrine as to the reproduction of the human form has been so far relaxed that the Caliph himself submits his features to the photographer.

But, while it is incontrovertibly true that this change, this intellectual quickening among Moslems, is due to contact with Christian civilization, it must not be forgotten how much that civilization owes to the Arabs and to the earlier and more bril-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liant Moslem civilizations. Moslem universities were the schools of Europe in the Middle Ages, and the Mohammedan teachers of medicine, mechanics, chemistry, astronomy, history, architecture, and even geography, were like beacons set on a hill in the intellectual darkness of Europe. To quote a distinguished Moslem of India, "Europe stands on the shoulders of Islam." In the same way, we know how far China was once ahead of Europe, and both the Mohammedan and the Chinese civilizations, flowering early, were doomed to a long period of stagnation. Now there are signs of revival, and Christianity is asked in turn to give inspiration to its quondam teacher. The renascence of Japan is a great stimulus and is used as an analogy, without any particular discrimination. It is too often forgotten that the renascence in the Far East is not religious but national.

The main difficulty, however, from the Pan-Islamic point of view, is the character of the Moslem religion. Christianity is a spiritual belief and a moral code, and the Japanese, having no spiritual belief of their own, have adapted Christian civilization and grafted it on to their own moral code; but Moslems are bound in every relation of life, and in their whole attitude towards matters spiritual and temporal, to a definite and prescribed code. So long as the Moslem races preserved their militant character, so long as they were led by strong and warlike chiefs and lived a full and strenuous life, their religion was a vivifying one. But with political decadence came religious decadence, and this, despite assertions to the contrary, not only because the spirit of Islam was gradually overlaid with dead forms, but because it was essentially lacking in the elements of permanent virility. Considered from a purely material point of view, Christianity has stood the test of time far better, and is more likely to continue to hold its own because it allows the fullest possible scope for individualism.

The claim that Islam is equally elastic is one on which it is perhaps presumptuous to dogmatize; but the evidence of history is to the contrary. The prosperous period of Islam was the period of fanaticism. The possibility of reconciling all modern developments with the words of the Koran does not meet the case. This species of casuistry cannot conceal the truth that, under such conditions, Islam tends more and more to become the husk and not the kernel. We see in Europe the spec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tacle, not unnoticed by Moslems, of one of the erstwhile most devout Christian nations given over to secularism or worse. "God has made these Christians mad so that Mahomet may come to his own," is the Moslem comment. But the wave of indifferentism and formalism which has submerged Islam also is not so easy to roll back, and, although the improvement in the cultural status of Moslems has led to a revival of their historic pride and even to the stirrings of national feeling among them, yet the political disintegration which has taken place makes any general revival extremely difficult.

One of the first *desiderata* for a Pan-Islam revival is a real centre. We have seen that the Caliphate has been strengthened with a view to providing this; and, as Turkey is the most independent Moslem state now existing, everything seems to point to Constantinople as the natural focus of all efforts. The pilgrimages to the Holy Places, instituted by Mahomet as a bond of union to his people, continue to be of value in keeping the Moslems of all races in touch with each other, and are used by the Senoussi and other organizations for purposes of political propaganda. But, as we have already seen, Abdul-Hamid is identified with the party of political reaction, while at the same time he is unacceptable to some of the fanatics of his coreligionists. Moreover, the political situation of Turkey is too precarious to admit of any bold measures either of reform or reunion, nor has it that national cohesion or vitality which would enable it to emulate Japan in the reorganization of its forces. The Near East has become to such an extent the appendage of Europe, and the cockpit of its rivalries, that it would be difficult for the most virile and strenuous of peoples to develop on national and independent lines; but Turkey is the home of a people whose natural ability and energy have been sapped by centuries of incompetent and oppressive government. Neither Morocco, Persia nor Afghanistan could conceivably be taken as leader and centre of a Moslem revival. The Persians, for one thing, are largely schismatics; the cultural level of all three countries is low; and all are equally dominated by considerations in the foreign policy of European Powers. Their political future is obscure, but one thing seems certain—they may follow, but they cannot lead, in any movement for the revivification of Islam.

It may be well at this point to attempt to define the aims of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Pan-Islamites. Their name is as misleading as are similar terms applied to political and ethnographic groups elsewhere. Associations bearing this generic term are found to-day in London, Paris, Geneva, the United States and other foreign centres. How far their organization is developed in Moslem countries it is impossible to say, but there are nearly a dozen publications devoted to their propaganda, six of these appearing in Cairo. A distinguished French writer, M. Binger, who is also the head of the African section of the Colonial office, defines their aims as twofold, and more or less alternative. Either the wide and rather chimerical design of so reviving the religion of the Prophet as to restore the prestige and glory of the East (as compared to the West), or, failing that, to form new Islamic groups having as their aim merely the preservation of the Faith. The means for accomplishing these ends are to be the coalition of existing Islamic states or the organization of religious forces to work throughout the Moslem world for one or both of these objects. So far, the last part of the programme is the only one which seems to be actively realized.

Like all wide and vague movements which are not so much positive as negative in their aims, Pan-Islam will inevitably make itself felt in a number of developments apparently disconnected, but in reality united by the anti-foreign sentiment. This is regrettable from the point of view of the best exponents of Pan-Islam, who desire to raise the general level of their co-religionists rather than to place them in antagonism to their environment, but the anti-foreign propaganda is the most tangible and most intelligible feature of the whole programme. Moreover, the movement is one that will be increasingly difficult to control. The Sultan, inspired and dominated by the militant Senoussi, has undoubtedly set in motion some of the machinery which is provided by the secret service of that brotherhood. In the recent crisis in the Near East, he found himself between the devil and the deep sea, and could not have yielded the essential points with regard to the Macedonian provinces without calling down the wrath of his own people. The crisis was averted by diplomatic tact, and the Sultan "saved the face of the Powers" by what the European press euphemistically described as "submitting to the mandate of Europe." The interest taken in this incident has not subsided, and moreover the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most unmistakable signs of unrest are noticeable in Algeria, Tunis, Egypt, and even in Central and East Africa.

The spread of Islam in Africa is one of the most striking phenomena of the nineteenth century, and, taken in connection with the cultural revival of the Moslem world in Asia, is the feature in the situation which is of the gravest import. There are three currents of Mohammedanism which are spreading in Africa—from the Upper Nile, from Zanzibar into the Congo region, and lastly up the Niger basin. Christianity, which is only a feeble plant in these regions, is likely to be overwhelmed altogether, just as the flourishing North-African church was overwhelmed by the Arabs at an earlier stage of history. There are many thinkers, even outside the Moslem world, who incline to the belief that Christianity has proved a failure in Africa, and that Mohammedanism is more likely to prove a civilizing force there. It is a religion which, in its simplest form, appeals strongly to semi-barbarous peoples, and certainly raises them above their old level; but, in estimating the effect of this Moslem movement in Africa, it is impossible to disregard the evidence of history. We are too apt to imagine that, with the exception of Egypt and the Mediterranean fringe, the northern half of Africa has no history, but readers of Lady Lugard's recent book, "A Tropical Dependency," will be aware of the fallacy of this idea. It is more than probable that we have as yet only penetrated the outer shell of that phase of human development which has taken place in the Dark Continent. Recent scientific examination has exploded the theory that the extensive ruins of Rhodesia are the work of European or Asiatic invaders, and they now appear as relics of a lost stage of negro civilization, no further back than the sixteenth century. The researches of French writers have also opened for us the pages of North-African history, so that we know that the Soudan and the heart of Africa down to the Niger region were at one time the seats of great black empires, possessing civilizations considerably ahead of the contemporary European states. The civilizing influence was Mohammedanism, which continued to flourish in Africa after its period of decadence had begun in Europe. Coming from East and West, from Morocco and Egypt, the two currents of Moslem influence met at last on the banks of the Niger. Timbuctoo, the Queen of the Soudan, was the centre of a black Islamic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civilization which won recognition from travellers who belonged to the most eclectic and cultured country of the day. Our European ancestors seemed to the refined and learned Arabs more barbarian than the blacks of Negroland, and the fact that this civilization, however imperfect, existed with sufficient stability to maintain empire after empire through a known period of 1,500 years, in a part of the world which (to quote Lady Lugard) "mysteriously disappeared in the sixteenth century from the comity of modern nations," is so singular a phenomenon as to merit a closer study of this region than it has yet received.

The conclusions to be drawn from this half-obliterated page of history for the purposes of this article are not altogether favorable to the idea of Islam as a regenerating and civilizing force in Africa. The causes of its decay in Europe and Asia were equally potent in Africa and are well given by an Arab of the fourteenth century. As a political engine Islam, he says, writing of the Moors, proved incompetent to secure liberty of the individual, and the Moslem states were enslaved by their own Caliphs before they were overthrown by strangers. The relapse of the ancient Moslem kingdoms of the Soudan from a condition of orthodoxy, prosperity, peace, good government, and respect for learning into a state of semi-savagery cannot be disregarded in estimating the force of Islam to-day. Christianity may have failed in North Africa, but has Islam done better? Its recognition of slavery, which, although practised in Christian states, was essentially opposed to the doctrines of Christianity, has been one of the main causes of the downfall of modern Powers. The degenerating influence of slave-owning and the impossibility of building up securely any state save on a basis of individual freedom have reacted with sinister results on all Moslem states and made African civilization evanescent.

Nevertheless, the outlook for those Christian European Powers which have large African possessions and spheres of influence is increasingly grave. Sir Charles Elliot, late Commissioner for British East Africa, writes:

"Mohammedanism can still give the native a motive for animosity against Europeans and a unity of which they are otherwise incapable. Had Uganda become Mohammedan, which was at one moment quite possible, the whole of the Nile Valley and of East Central Africa might have been in the hands of the Mohammedans, ready to receive and pass on any wave of fanaticism."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the present time, Uganda is more and more inclining to Islam. A form of Islam has overrun Nyassaland, and on the coast it continues to gain ground, especially with the Swahili. In detached groups the faith of the Prophet has reached the Zambesi, and there is a Moslem community in Cape Colony.

The vital question is whether or no there is a real integrating power in Islam. So far it has not evidenced this since the era of fanaticism, and it has been during recrudescences of this fanaticism that the power of Moslem states or peoples has from time to time reasserted itself. The bogey of Europe is the possibility of such a recrudescence occurring in regions where European control is necessarily weak in numbers and depends chiefly on moral force. France and England, the two great colonial Mohammedan states, are chiefly interested, but the whole of Christendom must be deeply concerned with this question.

So far as Pan-Islam, on historic grounds, aims at the restoration of Mohammedan prestige and world power through an attempted revival of "the spirit of Islam," there seems no special ground to expect any more startling development than the gradual modernization of Islamic states under European tutelage. Nor do the divisions in the Moslem world show any signs of being forgotten in this development. But a very different set of problems arises with the spread of Islam among the savage tribes of Africa. Pan-Islamites must not be too sure that the spirit they are evoking in the Dark Continent is one that will remain under their own control.

Here, then, we find the historic clue to some Pan-Islam aspirations which on first sight seem chimerical. What Islam has done before—a work begun eight centuries ago—may she not do again? But the leaders of Islam must not forget that, whereas in the Middle Ages Africa fronted civilization only on the north, she is now being penetrated from every quarter. The disintegrating influences are far greater and the inspiration of Islam has waned. It seems more likely that, by a too precipitate and too little controlled propaganda, the African natives may indeed receive from Islam a bond of union, but that, far from securing allegiance to the higher sense of Islam generally, the result may be to evoke a spirit which it will be beyond the power either of Sultan or Senoussi to control.

ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CONTENT OF THE MODERN NOVEL.

BY LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

THE Victorian novel is the heir of the Elizabethan drama. Its form is somewhat more bulky and the mode of indirect speech allows a wider swath to the descriptive powers. In the drama, the chorus or the monologue introduced philosophic commentary and criticism of life, but detailed description of scenery was somewhat difficult except in short and striking phrases. Nature in its more unusual moods played some part; storms, the sea, the heavens at night, and the stars lent themselves either to invocation or to simile; but the deliberately built-up word-picture, the visual effect woven of detail piled upon detail, belongs to the novel. Otherwise, the object and the method of the two forms seem profoundly akin. Their object is to purge the emotions by depicting scenes of terror and pity, as the old definition goes. Their means was a presentation of the occurrences of life and elaborated characterizations. As the value of the drama depended upon the skill with which the happenings were gathered together and built up into pyramidal shape, introducing and putting in motion a given set of characters, weaving their action up to a high point of intricacy and tension and then slowly letting out the knot to a point where there should be some sort of sense of finality, as well as upon the truth to nature and custom of the action, the interest of the characters drawn and the verbal power of the writer, so the value of the novel depends upon construction, force, truth, characterization and style. When one of these five elements fails altogether, the artistic effect of the whole is marred. The verbal felicity, the style, of Marlowe was often equal to that of Shakespeare, but he had little power of construction. Webster, who had a sense for plot and a wondrous gift of words, drew such abnormal characters that it is often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficult to believe them real beings. There were other playwrights with power of construction, and truthful perceptions, who lacked style, and it was in one only of the Elizabethans that the five elements met in supreme excellence and harmony.

The English novel began with recitals of unusual action or adventure, and passed on to that of manners and external conditions, and beyond that to the novel of motive or the psychological novel. Certain modern tendencies in the novel seem to derive directly from the novelist whom it is now modish to decry or overlook, George Eliot. The whole pity of human life, its desultory progress, its hapless and unforeseen failures, its unmeaning sufferings and collapses, these aspects of life—and with them also a certain reverence for humanity as mere humanity, a tender observance of its attainments however uncertain and fragmentary, its efforts however weak and spasmodic—certainly came into prominence with that great novelist. Characterization and truth were the great powers of George Eliot; characterization and style, of Thackeray; characterization with pathos and humor, of Dickens; force of emotion, of the Brontës. In Meredith, manner and criticism of life, or style and truth, have outweighed the other elements; and, in Hardy, sensitive verbal felicity and the intensity of the personal vision go far toward making up the painful beauty of his capricious world.

In all of these authors, one can still trace the structure of the earlier drama. The prologue itself is often spoken, striking the key-note of the theme and awakening the emotional mood to be maintained, as in the dream by the water in the "Mill on the Floss," and again in the mishap on London Bridge in "One of Our Conquerors." The introduction is often slow and detailed, leading the reader through years of the past history of the chief characters, enlightening him by means of anecdotes of childhood, infancy, the forbears, bits of gossip and different points of view, before the characters are actually set in motion for us. The climax, the fall, the catastrophe remain of the same nature. George Eliot was one of the first novelists to do away with the definite finality of ending, the "then they were married and lived happily ever after" type, like the good old-fashioned musical ending of the tonic chord following up that of the dominant seventh. She, like Chopin, would end on a questioning minor third, as in "Romola," or suddenly change the key and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finish with a cadenza of the related major, as in "Daniel Deronda," leaving us with no sense of finality or finish.

All these little innovations of structure are incorporated into the immediately present novel. Its structure is much slighter and its rhythm more perceptible. Its smaller bulk—few novels the size of "Daniel Deronda" or "Vanity Fair" would find a publisher in these swift-moving days—demands a great cutting of detail, and therefore we have much less vivid characterization. We get less of a sense of life in the present-day novel. Are there any characters that we know for love or for hatred as we do Becky and Dobbin, Beatrix, Pendennis, David and Dora, Peggotty, Little Em'ly, Dorothea, Gwendolen, Felix and a host of others? Last year, indeed, Boris and Dominie, Rickman, Flossie and Lucia were all presented with a wealth of detail which added them to the list of our intimate and living friends; but it must be admitted that their authors were severely reprimanded for their pains. For the tradition of the day leans toward a wide circle of slight acquaintances and short, very short, interviews. Brevity is the surest of modern appeals; and, though it is easy to see its commercial value, we run great risks of becoming mere creatures of scraps and patches. The art of omission, a great craftsman said, is the artist's supreme test; but omission, carried as far as the modern novelist has carried it, results in a pitiful meagreness.

The main changes, then, in the novel are a great falling off in bulk and a consequent faintness of impression, a shifting of the action from the outside of life to the inside aspect, a certain gain in definiteness of plot, fewer side issues and episodical interludes, and perhaps, on the whole, a lift in the general matter of style, if one take into account that in speaking of the past we are apt to speak only of a few supreme geniuses, whereas in the present we speak of the general average. This is a day when a great many people write pretty well; indeed, many of our novelists might readily join in Tennyson's lament that he could say things beautifully enough if only he had oftener something to say. Numberless people are boldly learning to write, taking elaborate courses in English without the faintest idea of whether they will ever have anything to write about or not. "If only," said one young enthusiast, "I learn to construct my sentences, the matter will take care of itself!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The two best novels of last year were written, one by a man, and one by a woman. The "Garden of Allah" and "The Divine Fire" loomed up above and beyond all their fellows. This year, the two best novels were written by women and by American women. "The Wheel of Life" and "The House of Mirth"* stand first and have other points of similarity beside the identical number of syllables in their titles and their authors' names. Both Miss Glasgow and Mrs. Wharton have chosen to set up a spiritual and an intellectual value against a background of sordid animalism. Both books deal with New York and with a set of people whose interests and occupations it is unhappily all too easy to know. Miss Glasgow's is a work almost primitive in its vigor and strength, the work of a genius. Mrs. Wharton's is a work still-pulsed, restrained, curiously impersonal, the output of an artist. The large play of life, the quick pulse and rush of emotion make Miss Glasgow's book all quiveringly alive, while Mrs. Wharton's is a carefully veiled, fatally truthful picture. These two authors represent the difference between the overwhelming impulse of genius, hewing its own way with an elemental force, and that of a highly wrought culture, conscious of its means and austerely selecting its effects. In structure, too, there is a great difference to be noted. Miss Glasgow's novel is more "enveloped," as the sculptors say. The framework is entirely hidden; the covering is large and irregular as life itself; the sweep of the rhythmic ebb and flow is so long that the little events come and pass, apparently, without relation to total impression, and without blending into the significance of the whole. This is like life and it gives us the feeling of life, its largeness and variety, its capriciousness and lack of selection.

Both these authors present a background of what one might call half-souls, creatures hardly awakened from the life of the senses, mere luxury-loving animals, whose highest reach is a certain reverent attention to personal cleanliness and social convention. It must be admitted that Mrs. Wharton's smart set is nothing like so repellent as Miss Glasgow's. The skill with which Gus Trenor is presented is due, perhaps, to the fact that the artist had no real shrinking to conceal. Mrs. Wharton deals with him as coolly as a naturalist with a familiar animal. She

* "The Wheel of Life," Ellen Glasgow: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1906. "The House of Mirth," Edith Wharton: Chas. Scribners' Sons, 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notes his looks, his instincts, his habits, his limited perceptions, the operations of his food and drink beclogged brain, and shows neither pity nor disgust. Her temperamental quiet is undisturbed. She never flushes into moral indignation; she neither reproaches nor regrets; she merely observes, and states the results of observation, with an entirely impersonal curiosity. Even Flaubert, in that most objective of all novels, "Madame Bovary," rouses himself once to exclaim upon poor Emma's power to corrupt even from the tomb, but Mrs. Wharton offers no judgments; she never appears before the curtain with a moral commentary upon the puppet-show. Now, whatever Miss Glasgow says or leaves unsaid, we cannot but feel her glowingly alive to the moral issues of her creation. She does not openly blame Perry Bridewell or Arnold Kemper that they are only half-way out of the stage of pure animalism, but she takes it keenly to heart and she shows them up mercilessly. Against them she places in vivid contrast Roger Adams, a great man and a living soul, one who has attained that noble asceticism which has renounced personal desire and ambition, even the most legitimate desire for fame, wealth, respect, love and ease, because only by renunciation can a sense of God enter into a life—a man who goes quietly and unobtrusively through existence, outwardly a failure, yet always holding his life out lightly on his hand for any man to take. It is by this contrast that the futile lives show for the cheap and vulgar things they really are. A great soul has only to walk across the stage of life for the small and mean things to show up small and mean in the resulting glow and brilliance. It is a search-light discovering new sets of values and pointing toward new worlds. In Mrs. Wharton's novel there is only the refined and over-cautious intellectual dilettante, Selden, to illuminate the spiritual struggle of Lily Bart. As it was, the fleeting glimpse he afforded of a life of independent intellectual judgments, "a republic of the spirit," changed the current of her existence and the latent nobility in her seized the suggestion and made toward the best—such a pitifully small best!—that environment offered. Lily Bart lived long enough to recognize the vulgarity of all her aims and desires; the tragedy of her helpless struggle with fatality, her vain effort and final passing is one of the great things that have been accomplished in a modern novel. The tale is terribly tragic, but it is true. Mrs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wharton's great gifts as a novelist are style, first and foremost, then clever manipulation of plot and unwavering truth of vision. Miss Glasgow's are force, characterization and profound insight into human experience.

It is a question whether one has a right to treat "Sturmsee"* as a novel at all. Mr. Holt admits that some of his critics objected to "Calmire" on the ground that he dealt only with people who talked about religion, and he considerately forewarns his reader that in "Sturmsee" he intends to talk only about people who are interested in social problems, and only at such times as they may be heard discussing social problems. Whatever one may think of the theories of social economy in the book, it is impossible to treat it as a work of art. The impulse of the author is not the æsthetic impulse of the creator, but the didactic impulse of the theorist. The descriptions of character are salient, keen and often epigrammatic, but they are done from the outside. The author stands off and looks on at his characters and comments upon them. Never for an instant does he enter into them and make them live. The descriptions are of the kind that make clever conversation, but the characters are *uncreated;* they do not live and move of their own volition, but to elucidate Mr. Holt's view of life; they are not people, but, with due apologies to Mr. Martineau, they are types of ethical theory.

As to the value of the theory, it is simply the old saw illustrated, that nothing succeeds like success. Mr. Holt's people are well fed and well bred; they have all the ease and conventions of the old-school gentlemen's lives; but the whole view of life, while it is canny in the extreme, is not spiritual, nor exalted, nor very deeply conceived. It is just such sublimated common sense as makes for plenty of coal and comfort. If a man fails, Mr. Holt shows him up as ill-balanced, epileptic, foredoomed to failure not by social conditions, but by an unimpeachable Providence. What men care for is the product of brains, he tells us, and hands are but the servants of brains and, he would suggest, must remain so. The trouble is that skilled hands help develop brains, and no one elects to remain without brains if he can help it; and the passage from being a servant to being a master is continually traversed, and another point to consider is that the very highest brains are not apt to conquer the world in the way

* "Sturmsee," Henry Holt. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Holt thinks. His type of the conquering brain is a man at the head of a tin-factory who makes money. But is this our highest type of brains? Have the greatest of reformers or the noblest idealists or the keenest intellects made money and subdued the earth? No! The best one can say is that if a man be worldly-wise enough, and healthy and lucky enough, he can usually make a comfortable berth for himself and, perhaps, for those who belong to him. But the highest and most sensitive type of man gets very little true happiness out of such achievement. It is still a heaven haunted by shrieks of others' far-off hell. If there is a purpose or a plan in the universe, Mr. Holt says, "nothing seems to me plainer than that it is part of that plan to evolve happiness through intelligence and morality." Perhaps; or perhaps it is just to evolve consciousness, spiritual consciousness, so that a man shall become not merely a good citizen of this world, but shall really have something in him worthy of further development, something that remains when the body and the things of the body are stripped off. It often seems as if human beings, instead of being live things in a universe of whirling dead matter, were partially dead atoms, striving more and more towards life, and as if pain and suffering and failure were the means to vitality. But Mr. Holt thinks not. His is rather the copy-book maxim plane of morality such as: "Honesty is the best policy." But, when all is said, though the book has no particular structure, and is but a voluminous ramble through the outer facts of a number of lives; while the characters are only names and never living people; while the emotion with which the book is written is never warmer than tepid, and the truthfulness never deeper than the most average vision may plummet: the book has the value of a conversation upon vital subjects of a gentleman who has seen much of the world, has succeeded there and noted the means of his success, and elaborated a theory of life.

It is almost inevitable that one should contrast "Sturmsee" with Mr. Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle."* "The Jungle" is the book of a young man, and a man who is still confident that there are means of preventing all the sorrows of the world. In this particular case we are offered the means of Socialism. Mr. Sinclair is too deeply interested in theories of life to write a

* "The Jungle," Upton Sinclair. Doubleday, Page & Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

real novel. The heat and force are to hand for the making of a fine book; but other necessary elements, characterization, structure, style and truth, are uncertain quantities. It is not because intensity ruins that the book is not a work of art; it is because the elements were too sparse, that, with all its terrible detail and all the author's emotion, the book cannot stand beside "Jude, the Obscure" or "Anna Karénina." The wretched Lithuanian peasants, sacrificed to the political and commercial corruption of the great city of Chicago, never quite *live;* they, too, are names used to point a moral and adorn a tale. The solution of the difficulties is all too facile. It is, however, a book to read, especially for those of us who, leading sheltered lives, are inclined to sit too comfortably in our bodies, feeling that the world is not so bad after all. If the conditions depicted in "The Jungle" are real, and we have good reason to believe them not wholly an hysterical vision, we are all more guilty than we feel; and, if we were wholly alive, each would realize himself his brother's keeper.

We turn now from two novels which are worth consideration as works of art, and two worth consideration as theories of life, to the general run and average, novels which are mainly good stories — books which, with more or less characterization and better or worse style, are written mainly as mere plots, situations, and fail of being notable because they lack depth of conception or truth, and intensity of emotion or force.

"The Conquest of Canaan"* is a very cheerful and pleasant little story. It bears a very faint resemblance to life, just enough to make it easy reading. The hero has all his ills at one time; and then, toward the end, in the twenty-third of the whole twenty-six chapters, the face of the universe changes, and the heavens, which have showered nothing but misfortunes and slights, send down fame and fortune, friendship and love, all in a bunch. The heroine, who goes to Paris to learn to dress, completely wins the hero by this noble achievement. She had lavished loyalty and tenderness, faith and devotion upon him in vain. He never noticed her; but, when she came back in Parisian clothes, he instantly forgot his less well-dressed dream of love and fell ardently

* "The Conquest of Canaan," Booth Tarkington. Harper & Brothers, 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in love with the clothes. They wooed and they won him. There is one pretty little touch, very true to nature, and both pathetic and diverting, in the last dancing party to which the heroine goes before she learns to dress, and this chapter of utter frustration and humiliation is the truest and the cleverest bit of writing in the whole book.

"The Day Dreamer"* is a book made wholly out of what one may most easily label suspense. The hero is a reporter of rather elevated stamp, and the interest of the book lies in not knowing from page to page just how the intrigue will turn to his triumph. The book is a mere plot, with no attempt at serious conception, force, characterization or style, and one reads it only to see how it will turn out. The process is a thing to get over as quickly as possible, that one may experience the little glow of satisfaction caused by the ending to all difficulties and the "then they were happy ever after."

"If Youth But Knew"† is of the decorative order of books. It is not serious, but it is highly adorned with poetic language, adventurers, mysterious wanderers playing violins while they climb hills, kidnapped ballet-girls and great ladies disguised as peasants. If one were not told in so many words that Napoleon was still alive, we might easily fancy ourselves back in the Middle Ages, when adventures were still rife and picturesque. However, no book that clings to the poetic conception of life and helps us to decorate it with bravery and high-sounding sentiment is to be totally overlooked, and these points are always at hand in the romantic tales of Agnes and Egerton Castle.

"The Evasion"‡ is a woman's book, and by this we mean a book of which the whole burden is love, love as the solution for all the groaning and travailing, the mistakes and the mystery of life. It is a well-written and seriously conceived story with more than a little truth of perception and power of portrayal. This writer needs only wider experience and deeper thought to do some writing really worth while.

* "The Day Dreamer," Jesse Lynch Williams. Chas. Scribners' Sons, 1906.

† "If Youth But Knew." Agnes and Egerton Castle. The Macmillan Co., 1906.

‡ "The Evasion," Eugenia Brooks Frothingham. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Spirit of the Pines,"* which is also a woman's book and upon the same theme, is a smaller book more prettily done. The touch is very light and delicate, and the little tale of love and pity is nicely wrapped up in an allusive familiarity with polite literature and gently applied moralities.

"The Clammer"† is a man's book of about the same size and quality as "The Spirit of the Pines"; but, since it is a book by a man, love plays a more subsidiary part, and there is a wider glancing into the field of usefulness, health and neighborly obligations. The style is Biblical and forced, but at times has a charm of its own.

"My Lady Baltimore"‡ is a more than commonly entertaining and readable story. The delicacy and charm with which Mr. Wister portrays a phase of life just vanishing and reproduces the atmosphere of Charleston is all above the average of production. Despite the thinness of material and superficiality of perception, there is something quite enthralling in the handling of the story. Mr. Wister, too, lives up to the present ideal of the novelist's vocation. He can always help us to while away an idle hour or a pause for boredom without demanding any sort of emotion or mental effort from his reader.

There are two books which, in their unrelieved preoccupation with the world of mental process, show a complete subjection to the French psychological school. Of these two, George Moore's "The Lake"§ is the slighter and the less painful. He escapes the vulgarity of tawdriness and triviality, the besetting sin of the average novelist, only to fall into the more harmful one of over-emphasis upon individuality. He presents the fallacy of self-realization, a stumbling-block, at some time or other, to most men except the fortunate few who escape by early bondage to a definite religious code. "Who heareth the eternal voice," said the most worldly-wise and worldly-weary of saints, "is delivered from many an opinion." The opinion that we are here to live for our own freedom, or pleasure, or self-expansion is subversive, and it is this attitude toward life and sin that George

* "The Spirit of the Pines," Margaret Morse. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906.

† "The Clammer," William John Hopkins. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906.

‡ "My Lady Baltimore," Owen Wister. The Macmillan Co., 1906.

§ "The Lake," George Moore. D. Appleton & Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moore chooses to decorate with wealth of natural description, familiar criticism of literature and art, and excellently painted local atmosphere. But the book with all its intellectual merits is both banal and vulgar in its morality, and one turns from it with a sigh of relief.

George Moore has given us a novel with a doctrine of self-realization at all costs. Miss Sedgwick in "The Shadow of Life"* has written a novel of renunciation. Relentlessly cruel and sickeningly painful, we instantly compare it to Balzac's "*La Recherche de l'Absolu*" only to realize that we are two generations more recondite, more abstract and more advanced in subtlety. All the dangers of being over-conscious of mental processes stand out in "The Shadow of Life." The hero and heroine watch themselves not only as actors but as wills, and they are sensitively conscious of the self of quiet behind the self that projects action, the self which looms indifferent to all results. In reading this book, one is apt to feel a certain impatience at dealing with so much abstract thought in the form of a novel; the theory of life would be more forcible if divorced from the paraphernalia of the novel-form. Despite the fact that Miss Sedgwick's book is of a high order, as is her brave emphasis of the personal note, making her book without regard to precedent or pattern, it is a painful task to read it. The detailed study of the slow paralysis of the will, and deadening of the emotions, of the misery the well-meaning hero casts wherever he goes by his false and selfish renunciations is too full of dull and unrelieved misery to be accepted voluntarily.

The main reflection to which one is brought by looking over modern novels is that the novel is a passing form; it has had its day and must cease. It has been overdone and cheapened until it is difficult to take even the finest novels with seriousness. The external novel, the novel that lacks brooding and profundity of truth and force of emotion, is simply negligible; and the novel of mental process, in this age of tottering faiths and insecure philosophies, is apt to be too painful to convey the pleasure which should be given by a work of art.

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

* "The Shadow of Life," Anne Douglas Sedgwick. The Century Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: BERLIN: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *May, 1906.*

ENGLAND discussing an Education Bill is a curious spectacle. No one who has once witnessed it would ever again describe education as a dull subject. The excitement it produces, the passions and even the ferocities aroused by it in this country, have a scale and a depth that would probably astound and mystify an American. That is mainly because when Englishmen engage in an educational controversy the last subject they mention is education. An Education Bill in the English Parliament always resolves itself into a battle, not between educational "experts," but between rival sets of theologians. English history and conditions, and certain peculiarities of the English temperament, have made it inevitable that this should be so. The fact, however, is none the less deplorable, deplorable from almost every standpoint, and not least from that of educational efficiency. It gives aid and comfort to those manifold influences that prevent the English people from regarding education seriously and by itself. I well remember that, some three years ago, the late Bishop of London startled his countrymen by declaring that "England has a contempt for knowledge." Dr. Creighton knew whereof he spoke. If any man's experience could be thought wide enough to justify so grave and comprehensive an indictment, his could. Like most English Bishops, he began life as a schoolmaster; he was for many years a great teaching professor; he was also a historian who held his own with Froude, Lecky, Freeman, Green and Gardiner; he had come into contact, more or less intimate, with thousands of young men; and from the high position to which he eventually climbed he looked abroad with keen, wide-opened eyes. And that was the conclusion to which his busy and varied life had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forced him—that the English despise knowledge, are intellectually lazy, trust far too complacently to their "practical qualities," and betake themselves to scientific study "in a spirit of condescension."

I am myself very much of Dr. Creighton's opinion. There are, it is true, some hopeful signs of an awakening, but it is still broadly true that the English are not really in earnest about education and that it remains a cause to which they will pay lip service, but for which they will not take off their coats.

The State spends an enormous amount of money—at present something like $70,000,000 a year on primary education alone—but I do not think it gets the best results. The elementary schools, through the policy on which they are administered, suffer by being made the battle-ground of fanatical sectarians. A national system of secondary education can hardly as yet be said to exist in England. In technical education little more than a beginning has been made. The Universities, while their spirit and atmosphere are admirable and their standards of scholarship most valiantly maintained, are hampered by an insufficient and outworn curriculum. An Englishman, indeed, who was asked to signify the most useful and creditable and distinctive features of education in England would probably end by pointing to some such seminaries as Eton and Rugby; and even they do far more to mould the characters than the minds of their pupils.

Manufacturing and commercial England is at least a generation behind both Germany and America in its recognition of the value of scientific instruction. Perhaps it would not be overstating the case to say that in none of the leading industrial countries is the educational system so divorced from, and of so little use to, the nation's business. Instances abound where important manufactures have been wrested from the English because their rivals have adopted more scientific methods.

Nor are these the only difficulties with which the cause of English education has to contend. That supreme belief in education as the indispensable ladder to success which pervades and animates America appears, by contrast, to be all but inoperative in England. The average Englishman, especially among the poorer classes, is not only less curious-minded, less eager for information, than the average American, but he lacks one of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

main incentives to the acquirement of knowledge—the incentive of feeling that there are a thousand chances ahead of him which knowledge alone will enable him to utilize. His horizon is narrower and the scope of his opportunity more contracted.

It is difficult to convey to Americans, except in a general way, any idea of the educational situation in England. Roughly speaking, the opinion of this country is opposed to a purely secular system of public education. It has no wish to banish religion from the schools. Yet it is equally opposed to paying, out of public moneys, whether rates or taxes, for the teaching of one denominational creed in preference to another, and it is scarcely less willing to accept the theory that the State should provide for instruction in all denominational creeds. Between furnishing equal facilities for all sects and no facilities for any sect, it has for the past five and thirty years adopted a compromise. This compromise found expression in the famous Cowper-Temple clause of the Act of 1870, the Act which first gave to England what Americans would call a public-school system. That clause declared: "No religious catechism or religious formula which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school." The clause did not apply to the Voluntary Schools —that is, the schools built, endowed and owned by the Established Church; and it was accompanied by a "conscience clause" under which a child might be withdrawn from religious lessons. The system has worked fairly well. The Church-of-England schools have continued to teach the Church-of-England doctrines, and the public elementary schools have expounded the fundamental truths of Christianity in a way acceptable to both Anglicans and Non-conformists. But if, from the theological standpoint, the compromise worked passably, from the educational standpoint it proved a failure. The public elementary schools were managed by local elective bodies called School Boards. They came into existence as occasion demanded. "Distributed haphazard over the country, the areas in which they operated were irregular; they had no jurisdiction over the Voluntary Schools in their districts; they had unlimited powers of expenditure, while rating authorities were obliged to honor their precepts without question." Moreover, they were unconnected with and uncontrolled by the authorities responsible for secondary technical education. At the same time, the Voluntary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Schools, being supported not from the rates but by the private subscriptions of Anglicans and by grants-in-aid from the Government, drifted into a very unsatisfactory condition, many of their buildings being defective and ill-equipped, and the education provided in them falling short of the proper standards. Both the undenominational and the denominational schools stood, therefore, in need of reform. But the difficulties of reforming them, of putting them on a sure foundation, and at the same time of reconciling the religious differences involved, were greatly increased by the facts that over half the children of England are educated in the Voluntary Schools, and that in several thousand villages the Voluntary School is the only school.

The Act of 1902 met these difficulties in the following way: It abolished the School Boards and made the local County or Borough Council the supreme education authority for the district, with equal power over the secular curriculum in both public and Voluntary schools. That was a great gain and a great step towards efficiency. The Voluntary Schools, at the same time, were made a public charge and thrown on the rates, the Established Church thus being relieved from the necessity of supporting them. In return for this, the managers of the Voluntary Schools were required to provide the school buildings, free of charge, for use as a public elementary school, to keep them in repair, and to make reasonable alterations and improvements if required. On the other hand, they retained the right of teaching their own doctrines in the schools; no teacher appointed or dismissed by them could be discharged or reinstated by the local education authority except on purely educational grounds; and in the management of the Voluntary Schools four directors were to be appointed by the local Churchmen and two by the local education authority. Against these provisions, the Dissenters strongly protested on the ground that the rates were being used to support a denominational creed; that, while the people were finding the money for the support of the Voluntary Schools, they had only a very partial and incomplete control over them; and that the Act practically excluded qualified teachers from the majority of the schools because they were not members of the Established Church.

I believe there was a certain substance in these complaints, and that, especially in places where the only existing school was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a Voluntary School, the Act worked harshly for conscientious Dissenters. But I am not at all sure that Mr. Birrell's Act, introduced a month ago and now the subject of furious debates in the House, does not commit an equal injustice against the Church. Mr. Birrell proposes to bring the Voluntary Schools under the full and entire control of the local education authorities. The religious instruction to be given in them must be purely undenominational, though on two mornings in the week, out of school hours, at their own expense and through the medium of specially imported teachers, the owners of any Voluntary School may provide religious instruction according to their own creed for such as care to receive it. Where the parents of four-fifths of the children desire it, a school in an urban area may still continue to exist as a denominational school, and the teachers employed in the school may dispense the religious instruction required, but not at the public expense. The local education authority is to lease the schools from their present owners, paying rent for their use on five days in the week from nine in the morning until four in the afternoon, and bearing all the cost of maintaining the buildings, the present owners to retain exclusive possession of them during the whole of Saturday and Sunday and on week-day evenings. Finally, a Commission of three, presided over by a lawyer, is appointed by the bill to determine the best means of adapting to the new conditions the trust-deeds of all such Voluntary Schools as are dedicated in perpetuity to educational purposes. Such is the main outline of this momentous measure. It is being vehemently opposed by the Church; by the Irish Nationalists, who are fearful for the fate of the Catholic schools; by the Jews, who are similarly anxious on behalf of their own establishments; and by the Labor party, who almost to a man are in favor of a system of purely secular education. With such opponents against it, I see very little chance of the bill's passing in anything like its present form. If it does, I predict with confidence that the House of Lords will reject it. In any case, we are in for a peculiarly English uproar of almost measureless virulence. It may shake even this Government that reckons its normal majority by the hundreds. It must, I think, bring England a long step nearer to the admission that religious instruction is a thing not for the State but for the parents.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *May, 1906.*

THE tug-of-war between the Russian Autocracy and Democracy will be in full swing before this article sees the light. It will be war to the death, with original Slav accompaniments. It is the second chapter of the revolution, the modest beginnings of which I described in the REVIEW of January, 1905. Nobody can tell what the vicissitudes will be, not even the friends of the Tsar, who are now busy strengthening the weak points in their rusty armor. They are making active preparations for the fray; but for their ordnance they are employing peculiarly weak material—paper—after the manner of the Chinese, who place in their fortresses wooden or papier-maché guns painted to look like steel cannon. Apprehending mischief from untamed deputies, M. Durnovo and his friends are hastily issuing a series of little laws wherewith to keep the activity of the Duma within what they think to be reasonable bounds. "This subject," they say, "is taboo"; "that line ye shall not overstep," and so on. The delegates are to be kept on their good behavior. As if a tidal wave of elemental force could be held back by means of paper barriers!

The Council of the Empire is the workshop where the armor and armaments for the Autocracy are now being made—the Council of the Empire, which is an asylum for fossil officials. There are old men there who cannot walk, stand or even sit down without help, and who, judging by the advice they give, cannot reason, even with considerable help. One of these is Count Pahlen, whom I knew as Minister of Justice in the reign of Alexander II thirty years ago. This hoary old invalid, whose native tongue is German, besought the Tsar to insert among the fundamental laws, which are to keep the new legislative assembly in bounds, one statute to the effect that no bill tending to facilitate or permit the expropriation of land for the purpose of selling it to the peasants shall be discussed or laid before the Duma. The word "expropriation" shall be struck out of the dictionary. Russian farmers, whose words and thoughts and dreams are of land, shall not be allowed to utter the word! Count Witté, when this extraordinary bill was brought forward by Count Pahlen, exclaimed: "If you really want to drive the peasantry to insurrection, to revolution, the insertion of that paragraph in the fundamental laws will achieve the feat. Suppose the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peasant delegates ignore your restrictive clauses and bring in a bill of the kind you would prohibit. What then?" "We would have them called to order." "And if they persisted, and the House upheld them?" "We would dismiss the House, dissolve the Duma, and—" "And inaugurate insurrection!" exclaimed the Premier.

The bill did not pass; but that is a secondary consideration. The source whence it emanated is perennial in the bureaucracy. The men who enjoy the Tsar's confidence are imbued with the idea that you can shut down the safety valve of a powerful empire, and then put on extra pressure. When Witté will have gone—and at this moment he is certainly going—his successors, if they be of the stamp of Durnovo and Count Pahlen, will constitute the gravest peril for monarch and nation.

The other danger, equally grave, comes from the opposite side. The Liberal section, known as Constitutional Democrats, will find it a very arduous task to abandon bunkum for business, and contribute to the welfare, instead of exciting the passions, of the people. They are bound by a whole litany of promises to work miracles and accomplish the impossible. Civil rights for the Jews, autonomy for the Poles and others, shorter hours for the workmen, more land for the peasantry and no capital punishment for the murderer are among the numerous new reforms to which they are understood to be pledged. The Government is resolved to refuse them. And the nation is in a hurry and cannot wait. The extreme Left will sit in judgment on the Democrats daily until they have done something to justify the hopes they now arouse. For hope is everywhere prevalent and is stifling effort. Centuries of paternal government have rendered the Russian people self-helpless. They put their trust in others and therefore do nothing themselves; they will not even aid the others who are succoring them. Heretofore, it was the Tsar and his officials to whom they looked as children look to their parents; now it is the Liberal Party, and in both cases they asked for the moon. Disappointment, if it come, will engender anger, and anger beget violence.

The agrarian problem, for instance, is waiting to confront every party in power like a cruel Sphinx, ready to tear them to pieces. Nobody seems able to lay the mighty spirit which it was so easy to invoke. Naturally, all these things induce pes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simism, and everywhere prophecies of evil are rife. "The Duma will be dispersed with bayonets" is the usual formula; preparations for civil war in the shape of bombs and revolvers are the practical precautions adopted. But reasonable scepticism and benevolent hope befit the onlooker who has no stake in the game; and, above all, he should not judge the Russian by the standard he would apply to the American or the Briton. For he represents another type of civilization and a different race.

Even now a kind of civil war is being waged, although there is no rounded scheme and slight hope of success. Hence, political assassination, revolutionary arson, patriotic pillage are daily phenomena. We are almost grown accustomed to them as part of the established order of things. A band of armed men, sometimes disguised, attack a public institution or a private dwelling, seize and carry off the valuables it contains, and, if any resistance is offered, kill the men who dared to offer it and go their way unpunished. They are not vulgar criminals — very far from that; they are patriots, heroes, great men, to whom monuments are offered *in petto*. Even youths and children occasionally join in the work. Indeed, it is now becoming usual to employ children to throw bombs. The law cannot condemn children to death.

In Baku, a whole gang of revolutionaries—disguised as policemen, officers of the gendarmes and State Attorneys — went around visiting offices kept by wealthy citizens, chiefly Mohammedans, on the pretext that they must search for treasonable documents; and then they abstracted banknotes, gold, securities and all other valuables that could be easily turned into money. The merchants who thus fell a prey to the ingenuity and lawlessness of the gang, had no suspicion that the "men of the law" were other than they represented themselves to be. Indeed, nobody knows who is who. Generals, monks, tram conductors, policemen, priests, may turn out to be revolutionaries in disguise, or detectives. Over a hundred and fifty thousand dollars have just been abstracted by a number of "soldiers" who appeared to relieve the guard on duty some five minutes before the proper time. The guard, suspecting nothing, went away, and the relief party relieved the safes of the large sum mentioned. In February alone, the shortest month of the year, twenty-six attempts were made to murder and a very large number of victims were actually killed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An amazing incident, that sounds more like fiction than fact, occurred in Warsaw on April 23rd. In the Pavia gaol, there were a number of political prisoners characterized as "dangerous." Two among them had been sent for trial for having murdered a high official, one for having attempted to kill and the remainder for having put to death soldiers in the army. At eleven o'clock on the night of April 23rd, the Assistant-Governor of the prison was summoned to the telephone, to hear an order from the head police prefect, Colonel Meyer. He listened; it was Meyer's voice and intonation. There was no doubt in his mind on that point. The instructions were to get ready the prison van, that same night, to transfer ten of the most dangerous inmates, whose names he enumerated, to the citadel. The Assistant-Governor, whose hours of service were then expiring, transmitted the order to another assistant, who duly carried it out. At three in the morning, an officer of the gendarmes appeared at the head of ten constables. Introducing himself as Captain von Budberg, he presented the order of the Governor-General, typewritten on a printed form, properly signed and sealed. The Assistant Governor took the document, read it and then asked: "Will you not need an escort as well? There are ten prisoners and you have but ten constables. I shall give you—" "No, no. Thanks. That has been arranged for. I have a supplementary escort outside the walls." "Oh, very well."

The ten men were then taken from their cells and brought into the prison courtyard. It was still pitch dark, and semi-opaque lanterns threw an uncertain light on the features of the prisoners and their gaolers. Was there a smile on the faces of the conspirators? The "policemen" stood in two rows, face to face, resolute and gloomy. Between their ranks the doomed men entered the van in silence and took their places. Two of the constables also went inside and sat with them. Two others seated themselves on either side of the driver, two more guarded the door of the van and the remaining four followed on foot. They have never been heard of since. The driver was found gagged and bound, but otherwise unhurt, and, not far from the place where he was sitting, ten policemen's uniforms lay upon the ground. Truth is sometimes stranger than fiction.

The police and gendarmes who guard the imperial palace of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tsarskoye Selo have had their wages raised by twenty-five per cent. since that mysterious rescue, and special precautions will in future be adopted to hinder assassins in the guise of gendarmes from entering palaces and Government buildings. Henceforth, every important order given by telephone will have to be verified. But against mistakes like that made by the Assistant Governor of the Warsaw gaol there is no absolute guarantee. And a mistake on the part of the authorities, say, at Tsarskoye Selo, might have terrible consequences.

The class of assassins is becoming numerous in Russia, and it is also growing influential. Two of the earliest measures, it is affirmed, which the entire Liberal party will introduce into the Duma, are an amnesty for all the men who have committed political murders in the past, and a law forbidding the Government to condemn to death any one guilty of that or any other offence in the future. The northern Slav feels pity for criminals, as well as for innocent victims, and hates capital punishment. Russians are Asiatics, and should not be judged by the American standard.

Gorky's mission to the United States, as emissary of the Revolutionary party, was an egregious blunder. For there are not many public men in the Tsardom less congenial to Americans than this Poet of Trampdom who knows no language but Russian and no manners but those of his former fellows. The circumstance that he was chosen for the mission shows how little Russian democrats understand Americans. They have other men in their ranks who are resourceful, diplomatic, civilized and sympathetic. But they chose Maxim Gorky, thinking that this incarnate protest against civilization would carry with him the people of the United States and reap a splendid harvest for the coming insurrection. That was their cardinal and initial mistake. All the rest followed inevitably. It was interesting, and at times amusing, to note the reflection upon Russian society here of what was being done in the United States. For instance, when Russian Radicals read of the enthusiastic greeting accorded to Gorky in New York, they were unable to write of the "free citizens of the Great Republic" in any tone but that of Byzantium, to which they were accustomed. Their praise was undiluted, their adjectives were nearly all superlatives. Mark Twain also came in for a puff of incense smoke, heavy enough

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have suffocated Shakespeare. Then occurred the painful finishing episode: the Russian writer who had gone up like a rocket came down like a stick, and thereupon all his political friends changed their views and sentiments in a twinkling. The American people, it was discovered, do not know how to treat women. Russian revolutionists can teach them. Mark Twain? A puffed-up nobody!

The American people have been attacked bitterly and rancorously for insulting a woman* who relied upon their hospitality, and the principal Radical organ here, in a powerful leading article, characterizes them thus: "Thomas Muntzer's cutting phrase is borne in upon our minds—a phrase which is, however, not only cutting but instinct with honest bitterness: 'A people who preach salvation by faith alone are mere fattened hogs!'" Poor Americans!

But, after all, the Yankees got off very cheaply with a paper protest. They may consider themselves much luckier than the French, who, for having lent their savings to Russia and saved her from ruin, are now to be boycotted by the whole Radical population. Happily, that section of the Russian people is not wont to lavish its spare cash upon dry champagne, generous burgundies, costly clarets and those other exports for which the wealthy non-boycotting classes pay.

Beyond the Tsar's dominions it is difficult to realize the mental attitude of the Russian Radical towards the loan. Logic blushes at it. One of the most powerful arguments adduced against the bureaucracy is the distress it has produced among the peasantry, who constitute the bulk of the nation. There is no doubt that the economic condition of the tillers of the soil is deplorable. The Liberals add that the peasantry are actually starving. That, too, is true of the population of some districts. Help is, therefore, needed immediately in the shape of financial relief, but the Government had no money. Another three months of that dearth of cash would have had dire and irremediable consequences; gold, which was already at a premium, would have definitely disappeared from the country, the Gov-

* It is but just to add that the reactionary *Novoye Vremya* published an article by the proprietor, M. Suvorin, in which he says: "To tell the Americans that they have insulted a woman is just as though a cock were to teach the nightingale to sing. . . . America is celebrated for its respect for women."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment would have probably been obliged to take refuge in the printing-press, and bankruptcy would have loomed large on the horizon. The poorest classes would, of course, have suffered soonest, most and longest, while the members of the Government would have wholly escaped. Yet the endeavors made to raise money abroad were thwarted in every way by the Radicals.

This defect of the logical sense and these peculiarities in the psychological equipment of the Russian, added to the abnormal frame of mind which specialists term "revolutionary neurasthenia," render it impossible for any one to foresee the words and deeds of the deputies of the Duma or to forecast the policy of the Government. I may, however, state my personal opinion. The leaders of the Democratic party, which in all probability will gain the upper hand in the new representative chamber, are keenly alive to the necessity of proving to the world that they are not devoid of the political qualities which a great national party should possess. They will, consequently, set themselves to act with moderation and to endure with patience. The great danger which they will have to guard against is the impatience and impetuosity of their more advanced colleagues of the Left. As for the Government, my conviction is that it will begin by throwing over the one man who might have saved it—Count Witté. Then it will literally revel in repression. He will probably have gone long before the June number of the REVIEW is in the hands of its readers. I should not be surprised if his successor were the weak-minded, short-sighted official, M. Goremykin, who for some time past has been giving well-meant but ruinous counsel to the Tsar, and whose influence was to some extent moderated by the indignation of Count Witté.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, the advent to power of M. Goremykin will portend the speedy dissolution of the Duma, the recrudescence of the reaction and the renewal of the insurrection, with dire consequences to the Russian people.

BERLIN, *May, 1906.*

GERMANY, after twelve months of excitement in the domain of foreign politics, is in an introspective mood. In parliament and in the press, her politicians and writers are engaged in analyzing the causes of her unpopularity and inquiring why her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character and aspirations should be, as the Speech from the Throne alleged, maliciously "misjudged abroad." Many of them seem disposed to attribute the evil to a lack of international tact. Accordingly, they have started a campaign of reprobation against those of their compatriots who habitually act in the spirit of a recent Imperial oration, glorifying the German people as "the salt of the earth." Self-praise is proverbially no recommendation, and these moral censors have, consequently, pilloried, first and foremost, the vice of depreciating other nations by boastfully exaggerating the triumphs of German commerce, industry and shipping. Invidious methods of comparison, such as those systematically practised in the Fatherland, form a more prolific source of international hatred, they affirm, than even the envy which the astonishing prosperity of the Empire is generally supposed to excite among its rivals. And they add that the pernicious effects of these sins of arrogance are considerably enhanced by the blunders of a large body of German politicians, whom they accuse of canvassing impossible schemes of conquest to the grave detriment of the national interests. These buccaneer protagonists of a Greater Germany, with their prodigious theories of racial consolidation, have successively offended the susceptibilities of almost all the great nations of the earth. One of their earliest acts of fatuity was to impress upon the mind of the United States their vision of large and thriving communities in Brazil becoming affiliated to the German Empire. What folly, exclaim the censors, to proclaim from the housetops the existence of such ambitions, and, by thus gratuitously fanning the flames of Monroeism, to render them forever impossible of realization. And as in the United States, so in Holland, Belgium, Denmark and Austria-Hungary, the predatory projects advertised by the Pan-Germanic League have proved a constant obstacle to the complete success of the Imperial diplomacy; while in Turkey the effusions of Pan-German agents have greatly retarded the slow and laborious process of inspiring the Sultan with confidence in the disinterestedness of his Berlin advisers. Even Russia has been forced to submit, in recent months, to the insult implied by the public discussion in the German press of the advisability of annexing the Baltic Provinces. Now, can it be deemed surprising, the preachers of political discretion inquire, if the nations of Europe, in view

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these wanton incitements to conquest, should contemplate the desirability of organizing themselves into a league of resistance against the perils embodied in the theories of Pan-Germanism?

The Pan-Germans show no signs of abating their activity in consequence of these attacks. They declare that it is their duty, regardless of foreign susceptibilities, to awaken the nation from what they term its political lethargy, and to prepare it for the pregnant hour when circumstances shall favor the consummation of their ideals. Their agitation, they argue, is a purely domestic affair; and it is within the province, as it is the business, of the Government, by disowning all association with the movement, to counteract any detrimental effect which it may exercise abroad. They are willing, they protest, to be abused as rantors if only the Government will act on occasion in the spirit of their theories. But this, they complain, the Government appears incapable of doing. Instead of conceding a monopoly of "words" to the agitators and confining itself to "deeds," it invariably fails to satisfy the "land-hunger" of the nation, while indulging its oratorical instinct to the full. This charge the Pan-Germans substantiate by reference to the Moroccan crisis, and they assert that, if German policy is the object of almost universal suspicion, the fault lies not with them, but with the Government and the Emperor, whom they describe as the victims of their own loquacity. In this argument, in so far as it applies to the sovereign, the Pan-Germans are supported by the representatives of almost every political party; for it is observed that, though the Emperor has kept the peace for eighteen years, yet he has endangered it, times without number, by his speeches. The sincerity of the frequent proclamations in which the monarch has avowed his determination never to pursue a policy of territorial conquest is seldom, if ever, questioned; but the apprehension is wide-spread throughout the nation that, in an unguarded moment, he may commit himself to some word or action from which a pacific retreat may prove impossible. These misgivings have been quickened by the Moroccan imbroglio, arising out of the Imperial visit to Tangier—a step that has been condemned as provocative even by staunch supporters of the Government,—and by the significant communication in which Prince Bülow intimated last summer that, in a few years' time, when the dignity of the Emperor would no longer be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

directly involved in the affair, the French, if they "knew how to wait," might reasonably expect to reap the fulfilment of their policy. In other words, German diplomacy was fettered and the tranquillity of Europe disturbed by the necessity of safeguarding the prestige of the Crown in a situation to which it should never have been exposed. The case is in no sense unique, and a review of the last two decades of German foreign policy discloses a long series of crises aggravated, if not precipitated, by the rhetoric of the Emperor, whose "winged phrases," it is urged, have supplied the foreign opponents of Germany with more polemical material than all the publications of the Pan-German League put together. In these circumstances, Dr. Theodor Barth, the Liberal deputy, who, though no expansionist, is a consistent advocate of a vigorous foreign policy, has stepped forward with the curious suggestion that, in future, a definite distinction shall be drawn between the utterances of the monarch and those of the Government. He declares that the time has arrived for the world to recognize that the oratorical performances of William II must be regarded not as official pronouncements, or as the expression of Imperial policy, but merely as the reflection of his own individuality. It is undeniably the case that in Germany the preeminent personality of the monarch has exercised a detrimental effect on the nation, in so far as it has prevented the development of independent individualities in the administration. Its constant intervention in the details of politics has, too, according to the testimony of men of such widely divergent views as Herr von Kardorff and the late Eugen Richter, appreciably diminished the fervor of the national loyalty to the monarchical idea, which was one of the most edifying features of the reign of Emperor William I. Of this the instructive comments of Dr. Barth furnish impressive confirmation. His suggestions are, of course, utterly unrealizable, and it is only necessary to imagine, for a moment, the bewildering effect of a formal notification to the world that Imperial speeches must not be confused with Governmental actions in order to appreciate their practical absurdity. Nor is it to be expected, as Dr. Barth seems to anticipate, that the nations of Europe will gradually learn to distinguish for themselves between the personal and official opinions of the Emperor.

The bitter controversy excited between the nations of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Triple Alliance by the Emperor's telegram to Count Goluchowsky, at the conclusion of the Morocco Conference, affords a fresh illustration of this obvious circumstance. That document gravely embarrassed the statesmen of Vienna by exhibiting their diplomacy in a light of hostility to France, and it exasperated public opinion beyond the Apennines by its implied threat of punishing Italy for her alleged disloyalty to the Alliance in supporting France at Algeciras. Like most of the Emperor's utterances, the message had, however, the possibly unconscious merit of candidly revealing the true state of German official feeling in regard to the European situation. That feeling, after as before the Conference, is mainly inspired by resentment at the isolation of Germany in the concert of Europe.

When Italy first joined the Triple Alliance, she was prompted thereto by various motives which are no longer present in the minds of her statesmen. She was threatened at all points by France. She feared the Republic in its character as the political ally of the Vatican, and she sympathized with Germany as the great Protestant Power whose policy was vigorously opposed to the temporal authority of the Pope. By France her future interests in Northern Africa were menaced with annihilation; and of Germany she required protection, not only against France, but also against Austrian expansion in the Balkans. As a member of the Triple Alliance, and supported by the sea-power of Great Britain, Italy might reasonably expect to prevent the development of an overwhelming French predominance in the Mediterranean. But, with the lapse of years, these considerations have undergone a radical change. In Protestant Germany, the Roman Catholic party has acquired a preponderating influence, and the German Emperor is compelled, by reasons of domestic policy, to cultivate relations of intimacy with the Pope, with whom France, on the other hand, is now on terms of open hostility. Moreover, the French Government has agreed to recognize the Italian claim to preemption in Tripoli, to which the diplomacy of Berlin, out of regard for the Sultan of Turkey, is necessarily opposed. And, finally, Great Britain, in complete estrangement from Germany, has become the firm friend and future ally of France, who no longer threatens the integrity of Italy.

These changes have essentially modified the character of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Triple Alliance. As Count Guicciardini, the Minister of Foreign Affairs at Rome, explained in his recent declaration to the Chamber, friendship with Great Britain was from the outset a primary condition of Italian adhesion to the Alliance. That friendship Italy is not prepared to renounce; but, relying upon Prince von Bülow's official disclaimers of hostility to Great Britain and upon the statements made in Paris and London that the Anglo-French *entente* is directed against no third Power, Italy will continue to regard the Alliance as the basis of her policy, which aims at the maintenance of the *status quo* in the Balkans and the preservation of the European peace. Germany is eminently dissatisfied with the Italian Minister's explanations. Some years ago, when Italy, in Prince von Bülow's phrase, began her "extra dance" with France, the performance enjoyed the approval of Berlin, which was then hoping to effect a diplomatic coalition against Great Britain. The relations between Rome and London were at that juncture far from cordial, and the Franco-Italian agreement regarding Morocco and Tripoli was interpreted as a blow aimed at British interests in the Mediterranean. Unfortunately for Germany, British diplomacy proved equal to the occasion; and France, instead of approximating to Germany, cast in her lot with Great Britain. The Moroccan crisis was precipitated and the Algeciras Conference convened in the conviction that it would effect a regrouping of the Powers in favor of Germany. While that Conference was proceeding, Professor Delbrück explained to the world that the fate of Morocco was in reality a matter of indifference to Germany. He admitted that the marvellous prosperity of Egypt under British rule, and the orderly conditions prevailing in Herzegovina and Bosnia, were convincing illustrations of the beneficent operation of the principle of entrusting to one Power the duty of administering an uncivilized country, while Macedonia might be quoted as a significant example of the confusion attendant upon international control. Germany could well afford, he indicated, to give France a free hand in Morocco; but she would run the risk of war rather than allow that country to enter into coalitions with other Powers with the object of excluding her from the business of world politics. Hence Germany, as an object-lesson of her power, would insist on the principle of "internationality" in the Shereefian Empire. The Conference is now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over. But Germany is still discontented, and she is venting her discontent on those Governments which failed to act at Algeciras in accordance with her expectations. Spain has been informed that the Emperor will not this year return the visit paid to Berlin by King Alfonso; Italy has been threatened with the eventuality of German support to Austrian expansion in the Balkans; and Russia, who refused to ignore the obligations of the Dual Alliance, has been deprived of the advantage of German cooperation in her latest foreign loan. These measures can scarcely be considered an effective remedy for the isolation of Germany in Europe, and they are vigorously condemned by that large section of public opinion which perceives in the "bullying tactics" of the Imperial Government the real cause of the many failures which characterize its foreign policy.

Apart from Austria-Hungary, the relations of Germany with the United States are regarded as the only satisfactory feature of the international outlook. It is claimed that Baron Speck von Sternburg has succeeded in definitely "curing" President Roosevelt of the illusion that the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race are destined to cooperate in the domain of international politics. It is now deemed to be the task of the German press to complete the work of conversion begun by the Ambassador, and to persuade the American nation that it must join with Germany in redressing the balance of power in Europe. Professor Delbrück and the semi-official "*Grenzboten*" are, accordingly, laboring hard to demonstrate the inherent antagonism between the interests of the United States and those of the British Empire. President Roosevelt's recent address to the German veterans they interpret as a signal proof that America is rapidly moving in the direction of an alliance with Germany against the power of Great Britain. From which it may be seen that Berlin politicians are still incapable of liberating themselves from the Bismarckian principle that to sow discord between the other Powers is the surest means of promoting the influence of the German Empire.

WASHINGTON, *May, 1906.*

WHEN the discussion of the railway-rate bill was resumed in the Senate on May 17th, there seemed to be good ground for believing that the measure in its amended form would be passed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that body before its adjournment on that day. Senator Tillman, however, posed a question which may occupy for some time the constitutional lawyers in the Upper House of the Federal Legislature. The bill, as it stands, confers power on the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe what, "in its judgment," would be a just and reasonable rate. Senator Tillman, who has the bill in charge, declared that he would not be responsible for the retention of the words quoted, if there was any doubt about their constitutionality. Senator Teller said that, for his part, he had never heard any satisfactory reason given for the insertion of the words. Senators Allison and Dolliver, who have been conspicuous among the Senators that have favored a restrictive court review, undertook to explain why the words should be retained. Senator Allison asserted that they conferred discretion upon the Commission and limited the scope of the court review. Senator Dolliver concurred in considering the words useful for those purposes, and, to show their constitutionality, recalled that Senator Knox of Pennsylvania had commended them in a speech made at Pittsburg, and had employed them in a bill introduced by him in the Senate. Mr. Knox replied that in his opinion the words were useless, and, if allowed to remain, would probably render the bill unconstitutional. He admitted that he had used them in his Pittsburg speech, but this had been done, he said, without due consideration of their true import, and, although he had put them into his bill, for reasons which he recited, he maintained that the fact did not commit him in any way to approval of them. He had arrived, he added, at the conviction that the words would probably be construed to mean a delegation of legislative power to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and would therefore be regarded by the Supreme Court as making the law unconstitutional. He believed the words should be excised, and notified the Senate that he would not be held responsible for their presence in the bill. Senator Foraker concurred with Senator Knox in thinking that the words, "in its judgment," clearly constituted a delegation of legislative powers, for which reason both he and Senator Bailey denounced the bill as unconstitutional. The impression prevails that, ultimately, the phrase will be stricken out of the measure.

The bill, in its amended form, is, of course, far from being

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what President Roosevelt and the Anti-Railroad Senators desire. They would have been satisfied originally with the enactment of the Hepburn Bill in the form which it bore when it left the House of Representatives; but, if it was to be amended at all, they desired the insertion of a clause, expressly limiting the powers of a United States Circuit Court to review the decision of the Commission, and especially the power to suspend by injunction the operation of a rate made by the Commission pending the adjudication of its validity. It soon became clear that to pass an amendment of that kind would require the votes of at least twenty-five Democratic Senators, as well as twenty of their Republican colleagues. In the hope of effecting such a combination, Senators Tillman and Bailey conferred with Attorney-General Moody, and an agreement was eventually reached by the three conferees as to the wording of an amendment intended to restrict a court's power of review. Whether such an amendment could have been passed under any circumstances will now never be known; but both Senator Tillman and Senator Bailey have expressed the belief that a bare majority could have been secured for it. President Roosevelt, however, evidently having arrived at the opposite conclusion, suddenly abandoned the attempt to effect a winning combination of Democrats and Anti-Railroad Republicans, and, without notifying Senator Tillman or Senator Bailey, or even, apparently, Attorney-General Moody, announced to a number of newspaper correspondents that he had decided to approve an amendment distinctly recognizing the powers of a United States Circuit Court to review rates made by the Commission, including the power to suspend a rate by injunction. The only material concessions made by the Railroad Senators were that a carrier's application for an injunction must be heard by three judges instead of one judge, and that there should be an expedited appeal from their decision to the Supreme Court. On this crucial point, therefore, about which there has been so much debate, it cannot be denied that the Railroad Senators have gained a decisive victory. Satisfied with this triumph, however, they seemed disposed to let their Anti-Railroad colleagues have their way with regard to many subsequent amendments of the Hepburn-Tillman measure, amendments by which the interests of railway companies and of the Standard Oil corporation have been sweepingly satisfied.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the most unpleasant incidents ever witnessed on the floor of the Senate followed a speech in which Senator Tillman recounted the efforts which had been made by Mr. Roosevelt to bring about a combination of Democratic Senators with Anti-Railroad Republican colleagues, and in which he expressed some resentment at the sudden abandonment of those efforts without notice to the Democratic Senators concerned in the negotiations. He plainly intimated that, in his opinion, the President had been guilty of an act of bad faith. In the course of his speech, Mr. Tillman had read from a memorandum made by ex-Senator Chandler the statement that, in conversation about the Hepburn-Tillman bill, Mr. Roosevelt had said that Senators Knox, Spooner and Foraker were trying, by ingenious constitutional arguments, to impair or defeat the bill. There was, on the face of it, nothing improper in such a remark on Mr. Roosevelt's part, and not one of the three Senators named would be likely to dispute its truth. Nevertheless, when Senator Lodge telephoned to the White House the statement that had been made by Senator Tillman on ex-Senator Chandler's authority, the President impulsively authorized him to denounce it on the floor of the Senate as "an unqualified and deliberate lie." This the Senator from Massachusetts proceeded to do, heedless of the fact that such language was shamefully out of place in a legislative body. A painful sensation was produced, not only in the Senate, but throughout the country, when people realized that the Chief Magistrate of the United States had arraigned an ex-Senator as the author, and a Senator as the endorser and sponsor, of a lie. It is universally recognized that Mr. Tillman, in his subsequent reply to the insulting arraignment, comported himself with admirable dignity and self-control. The temperate and manly letter, also, in which ex-Senator Chandler upheld the truth of the statement, contradicted so hastily and angrily by the President, was not only calculated, but qualified, to carry conviction to impartial readers. He riveted public attention on the fact that, not only was there a question of veracity between him and Mr. Roosevelt as to what had been uttered by the latter, but that another grave issue had been raised, to wit, whether the President, in his treatment of Senators Tillman and Bailey, had not been guilty of an act of perfidy. Subsequently, an attempt was made in two newspapers, published, respectively, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chicago and in New York, to defend Mr. Roosevelt from the charge of bad faith, on the ground that Mr. Chandler had told him that Senator Tillman suspected Senator Bailey of an inclination to cooperate with the Railroad Republican Senators in favor of giving the United States Circuit Courts large powers of review. This defence has by no means improved the President's position. The scrap of documentary evidence adduced in support of the assertion made by the two newspapers is, on the face of it, inadequate; and, when examined in the light of Mr. Chandler's testimony, is seen to be worthless. The indignation with which Senator Bailey repelled the imputation of bad faith was entirely justified, and he undoubtedly commands the sympathy of the Senate and of all fair-minded men in the community.

The other incident of great public interest which occurred in Washington during the first seventeen days of May was the report made by the Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals. The report, which was adopted by a vote of 6 to 4, recommends to the Senate a bill providing for a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama. The measure favored by the Committee directs the construction of a sea-level canal in accordance with a report and plan adopted by a majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers for the Panama Canal, created by an order of the President dated June 24th, 1905. The reasons why a majority of the Senate Committee prefer a sea-level type for the canal to the lock type (for which four of their colleagues voted) may be summed up as follows: the sea-level type is acknowledged, even by the advocates of a lock system, to be the ideal type for an international waterway, and the possibility of realizing it on the Isthmus of Panama was one of the chief arguments for selecting that route; secondly, a sea-level canal will be much more convenient than the lock type, and the maintenance of it will be easier and cheaper; then, again, its construction will be attended by no more, and probably less, hazard than that of a waterway requiring 170 feet of lockage and enormous earth dams resting on doubtful alluvial foundations; lastly, but a little longer time—the report estimates the excess at two years—will be consumed in its construction than would be required for one with locks of such unprecedented magnitude as are contemplated in the minority report. The decisive cause

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the adoption of the sea-level type by a majority of the Senate Committee is undoubtedly the San Francisco earthquake. But for that catastrophe, the attention of the Committee, and of the community at large, would probably not have been attracted to the indisputable fact that the immunity of the Isthmus of Panama from serious seismic disturbance cannot be taken for granted. Many destructive earthquakes have occurred in Central America and in Venezuela, and historical records show that the Isthmus itself has not been free from shock.

As regards the question of cost, which hitherto has seemed to constitute the most formidable obstacle to the acceptance of a sea-level type, the majority report of the Committee points out that, although nominally the difference in the cost of the two types is about $110,000,000, yet this amount is practically reduced by $40,000,000, representing the difference in the cost of maintenance—about $800,000 a year in favor of the sea-level type—which, if capitalized at two per cent., would yield the sum just named. The report adds $10,000,000 for the cost of the 118,000 acres that would be submerged by the lock plan, bringing the total cost of that type up to $190,000,000. The net difference in cost would, therefore, be only $60,000,000, which, though a large sum in itself, is considered by the Committee small, in view of the magnitude of the issues involved. It is understood, of course, that the sea-level canal recommended by the majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers, and now favored by the Senate Committee on Interoceanic Waterways, could not claim the title of the Straits of Panama, and differs from the Suez Canal in that it has tide-locks, and, also, a high dam at Gamboa, which is exposed to injury by earthquakes. Recognizing the last-named point of weakness, the majority report of the Committee points out that, whereas the locks provided for in the minority reports advocating the lock type would, for the most part, rest on alluvial foundations, extremely likely to crack in the event of seismic disturbance, the Gamboa dam is to rest upon solid rock reinforced by strong walls, and buttressed at either end by walls of rock. It seems a pity that, if the sea-level type is to be preferred, a precise counterpart of the Suez Canal cannot be secured, and a broad, lockless channel opened between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED